# PATROLOGY

## THE LIVES AND WORKS OF THE FATHERS OF THE CHURCH.

# PATROLOGY

## THE LIVES AND WORKS OF THE FATHERS OF THE CHURCH

BY

OTTO BARDENHEWER, D. D., PH. D.
PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF MUNICH

TRANSLATED FROM THE SECOND EDITION

BY

THOMAS J. SHAHAN, D. D.
PROFESSOR OF CHURCH HISTORY IN THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA

WITH THE APPROBATION AND RECOMMENDATION OF THEIR LORDSHIPS THE ARCHBISHOPS AND BISHOPS OF COVINGTON, FREIBURG, MILWAUKEE, OGDENSBURG, ST. LOUIS, SIOUX FALLS AND SPRINGFIELD

FREIBURG IM BREISGAU AND ST. LOUIS, MO. 1908
B. HERDER
PUBLISHER TO THE HOLY APOSTOLIC SEE
BERLIN, KARLSRUHE, MUNICH, STRASSBURG, VIENNA

Imprimatur.

*Friburgi Brisgoviae,* die 1 Maii 1908.

✠ THOMAS, Archiepps.

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

B. HERDER, Freiburg im Breisgau (Germany).

# APPROBATIONS.

*Milwaukee,* Wis., Jan. 10., 1907.

My dear Dr. Shahan,

Allow me to congratulate you upon the happy thought of giving us an English translation of Dr. *Bardenhewer's* excellent Manual of Patrology. You know that I have been long wishing for just such a book which is a real desideratum for educated Catholic Americans, especially the clergy and our candidates for the priesthood. Protestantism, Anglican and German, is trying to find in the primitive Church the historic foundation for its sectarian tenets, while Rationalism seeks in the early Christian writings for weapons with which to attack the credibility of the Gospels and the apostolicity of Catholic Dogma. How can the Catholic student successfully meet the enemies of the Church if he has no more knowledge of the Fathers and Doctors of the Church, those early authentic custodians and exponents of the *Depositum fidei,* than what he has gathered from a few disjointed texts or patristic quotations in a Manual of Dogmatic Theology, or from the short sketches of the lives and writings of the Fathers found in a Manual of Church History?

Yet, this is only what may be called the apologetic view of the study of the Fathers, suggested by the contemporary struggle of the Church defending her claim to be the original Church of Christ. There are many other valuable advantages of thorough patristic studies. A close acquaintance with the Fathers of the Church will furnish those who «search the Scriptures» with a fuller and clearer understanding of the manifold and often hidden meaning of Holy Writ. It will provide the Christian teacher, called to preach the word, with an inexhaustible supply of solid and attractive material. To the student of Church History, it will furnish a better and more correct insight into the true causes and character of events by throwing a wonderful light upon many questions of early Church discipline and law. Nor shall we overlook the precious gems of poetry and oratory, of narrative and description, found in early Christian literature, which compare quite favorably with the jewels of the pagan classics.

Dr. *Bardenhewer's* Manual is an excellent key to the rich and varied literature of the «Beginnings of Christianity» of which you have given us such interesting accounts. By your translation you have placed that key

in our hands. It is now the duty of priest and seminarian to open the door to the treasury of our early classics. May the «Manual» have all the success that it so richly deserves!

Yours very sincerely in Christo,

✠ S. G. MESSMER,
Archbishop of Milwaukee.

*St. Louis,* Mo., Jan., 20., 1907.

My dear Dr. Shahan,

I wish to congratulate you on the appearance of your translation of *Bardenhewer's* Patrology. I have heard much of the original, and am sure that in your hands it has lost none of its value. I bespeak for it a large circulation and shall take pleasure in commending it when occasion offers.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely yours in Christo,

✠ JOHN J. GLENNON,
Archbishop of St. Louis.

*Springfield,* Mass., Jan. 15., 1907.

My dear Dr. Shahan,

The appearance of *Bardenhewer's* Patrology in an English translation will elicit a scholar's welcome from all professors and students of Patristic Theology and Church History.

The excellency of the work in the original, and the well known fitness of the translator make our approval and recommendation an easy and willing evidence of our pleasure and satisfaction in its publication.

It should easily find space upon the library shelf of every seminarist and every priest.

† THOMAS D. BEAVEN,
Bishop of Springfield.

*Sioux Falls,* S. D., Jan. 12., 1907.

My dear Doctor,

I rejoice to learn that you have translated into English *Bardenhewer's* «The Lives and Works of the Fathers of the Church», and that *Herder* will publish the translation within the coming year. This is the best Manual of Patrology that I know; it will be a boon to our seminaries and our priests. In these days, when the historical aspect of Theology, its

development and evolution, are becoming as prominent and necessary as the Scholastic exposition of revelation, our seminarians and priests ought to have in hand the very best that has been done on the lives and works of the Fathers of the Church, since they are the exponents and witnesses of the growth of theology.

I remain, dear Doctor,

Fraternally yours,

† THOMAS O'GORMAN,
Bishop of Sioux Falls.

*Covington,* Ky., Jan. 15., 1907.

My dear Dr. Shahan,

The clergy of America ought to be deeply grateful to you for the translation of Dr. *Bardenhewer's* Manual of Patrology. The lives and works of the Fathers are not sufficiently known amongst us. Whilst few priests have the leisure to study them thoroughly, they should be acquainted in a general way with the teachings of the Fathers of the Church. They are the fountain heads of Tradition, the keys to the understanding of the dogmas of the Faith; they supply the most effectual armory in defence of Christian truth which the Catholic Church alone has kept in its apostolic purity of doctrine.

Hoping that both yourself and your publication will receive adequate recognition of your labors,

Devotedly yours in Christo,

† CAMILLUS P. MAES,
Bishop of Covington.

*Ogdensburg,* N. Y., Jan. 20., 1907.

My dear Dr. Shahan,

The reading public of America is deeply indebted to you for undertaking to present to it in an English dress the great work of Dr. *Bardenhewer* on the Lives and Works of the Fathers of the Church. A Patrology of that thoroughness was still a want among us. Hereafter no one will be excusable for misreading or misquoting those indispensable sources of the history of religion. You have my best wishes for a wide diffusion of your translation.

Faithfully yours in J. C.,

† H. GABRIELS,
Bishop of Ogdensburg.

# PREFACE TO THE FIRST GERMAN EDITION.

In the year 1883, I was requested by the publisher *Herder* to undertake a new edition of *J. Alzog's* Manual of Patrology (3. ed., Freiburg i. Br., 1876). External circumstances prevented me from accepting this flattering offer at once; the new sphere of labor to which I was called claimed for a long time nearly all my leisure and strength. The publisher entrusted to another the preparation of an improved edition of *Alzog* (Freiburg, 1888). On the other hand, as soon as circumstances permitted, I undertook the preparation of an entirely new work.

This work, which I now offer to the public, undertakes to present in a very concise and comprehensive manner the actual condition of patrological knowledge and research. It also aims, through its bibliographical paragraphs, to interest and guide a larger number of students in the investigation of special problems. It has been my purpose to quote from the earlier patrological literature only what seems most important, and similarly, to omit nothing that is important among the numerous later researches. As the subject-matter is very extensive, I have found it necessary to confine myself often to mere indications and suggestions, to omit too close specific discussion, and to leave aside what seemed of minor value. The nature of the work seemed also to impose a mere reference apropos of countless disputed points and questions. At some later time, I hope, God willing, to follow up this outline with a more thorough investigation of the entire field of patrology.

My colleague, Dr. *C. Weyman,* kindly undertook to share with me the labor of correcting the proofs of this work. I find it difficult to decide whether I owe more to the patience and accuracy of my friend in the revision of the printed pages, or to the solid erudition of the savant in his concern for the correctness of the text.

Munich, September, 1894.

THE AUTHOR

# PREFACE TO THE SECOND GERMAN EDITION.

The first edition of this book met with a very kindly reception. It was judged worthy by *Godet* and *Verschaffel* of being put into French[1], and by *Angelo Mercati* of translation into Italian[2] I was less pleased, personally, with the result of my labors. Had time and strength sufficed, I would have undertaken the preparation of an entirely new book. The first third of the book, the outline of the Ante-Nicene literature, was its weakest part, it appears now in an entirely new, and I hope more satisfactory presentation. This section of the work has caused a quite disproportionate amount of labor on my part, owing to the fact that I was preparing the same material in two forms: the first demanded a lengthy and exhaustive research for the comprehensive History of early ecclesiastical literature announced in the preface to the first edition, the second called for the concision and comprehensiveness of a manual. The remaining sections of the work, the defects of which are less manifest in the detail of description than in orderly disposition, could not receive at my hands so thorough a revision as would otherwise have been bestowed upon them.

The contents of the work are notably increased by the insertion of numerous writers and works omitted in the first edition or discovered since its appearance. At the same time the publisher desired to keep the work within its original limits. This could only be done by omitting what seemed unimportant, by simplifying quotation-methods, and by the use of more compact type for the bibliographical paragraphs. In this manner it has been possible to reduce the size of the book by some thirty pages.

I am indebted to several scholars, particularly to *Fr. Diekamp, A. Ehrhard, Fr. X. Funk, J. Haussleiter, G. Krüger,* and *C. Weyman* for many useful hints and suggestions. I am again especially indebted to Dr. *Weyman* for his careful correction of the printer's work.

Munich, April, 1901.

THE AUTHOR.

[1] Les Pères de l'Église, leur vie et leurs œuvres, par *O. Bardenhewer.* Édition française, par *P. Godet* et *C. Verschaffel*, de l'Oratoire. 3 vols., Paris, 1898—1899, Bloud et Barral.

[2] Patrologia, per il Dr. *O. Bardenhewer,* Professore di Teologia all' Università di Monaco. Versione Italiana sulla seconda edizione Tedesca, con aggiunte bibliografiche, per il Sacerdote Dr. Prof. *Angelo Mercati.* Voll. i—iii, Roma, 1903, Desclée, Lefvre et C^ie

# TRANSLATOR'S PREFACE.

The need of a reliable manual of Patrology in English has been so long felt by teachers of that science that little excuse is needed for the present attempt to place one within reach of all concerned. During the nineteenth century much patristic material, both new and important, has been discovered, East and West. In the same period there has come about a notable perfection of the methods and instruments of scholarly research, while literary criticism has scored some of its remarkable triumphs in the province of early ecclesiastical literature. Above all, the intense and crucial conflict concerning the genuine nature and actual History of the primitive Christian teaching has perforce attracted the combatants to one great armory of weapons: the writings of the Christian Fathers. Excavation and research among the ancient monuments of Roman imperial times have naturally quickened interest in all contemporary literary material. An intelligent study of the early middle ages has made clear the incalculable influence exercised upon the barbarian world by the Christianized civilization of the fourth and fifth centuries; the manners, politics, and tongues of the ancestors of the modern Western world can no longer be studied scientifically apart from a sound knowledge of what our earliest Christian masters were. At this distance, such knowledge must, of course, be gathered, to a great extent, from their literature, or rather from the remnants of it that survive.

It is to the credit of German Catholic scholarship that for a hundred years it has upheld the necessity of a solid academic formation for ecclesiastics, at least, in the science of the Christian Fathers. The names of *Lumper* and *Permaneder, Drew* and *Moehler, Hefele* and *Fessler*, to speak only of the departed, come unbidden to the memory of every student. German Catholic centres of study, like the Catholic Theological Faculty at Tübingen, have won imperishable fame by long decades of service in the cause of primitive Christian literature. Scholars like *Probst* and *v. Funk* have shed renown upon their fatherland and earned the gratitude of a multitude of toilers

in this remote department of knowledge. Only those who attempt to cultivate it, know what a lengthy training it exacts, and to what an extent it calls for all the virtues and qualities of the ripest scholarship. It is not, therefore, surprising that the best Manual of patristic science should come to us from that quarter of Catholicism in which our most ancient literature has long been studied with a devotion equalled only by the critical spirit that feeds and sustains it.

When such competent judges as the modern Bollandists agree that the «Patrologie» of Dr. *Bardenhewer* has no superior, for abundance of information, exactness of reference, and conciseness of statement, we may take it for granted that the work is well fitted to introduce all studious Christian youth into the broad and pleasant sanctuary of patristic science. The experience of ecclesiastical teachers confirms this judgment; for the work has already been translated, into both French and Italian. The English translator has added nothing to the text, being well contented if he has reproduced with substantial accuracy the already highly condensed doctrine of the author. However, a few slight additions and bibliographical items have been incorporated from the French and Italian translations. The translator has also added a few bibliographical references to patristic works and treatises that have appeared quite lately. It may be pleaded that he is dispensed from very finical completeness by the exhaustive study of *Ehrhard* (Die altchristliche Literatur und ihre Erforschung seit 1880 [1884] bis 1900), the second edition of *Chevalier's* Bio-Bibliographie (1905), and the admirable patristic Comptes-rendus of the Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique of Louvain.

The translator is much indebted to Very Rev. *Reginald Walsh,* O. P., who has kindly consented to correct the proofs, to the author, Professor *Bardenhewer,* for various services, and to others for welcome hints and suggestions.

THOMAS J. SHAHAN.

# CONTENTS.

## INTRODUCTION.


Page

§ 1. Notion and Purpose of Patrology 1
§ 2. History and Literature of Patrology 7
§ 3. Literary collections relative to the Fathers of the Church. Collective editions of their writings. Principal collections of translations 11


## FIRST PERIOD.

## FROM THE END OF THE FIRST TO THE BEGINNING OF THE FOURTH CENTURY

### FIRST SECTION.

### PRIMITIVE ECCLESIASTICAL LITERATURE.


§ 4. Preliminary Remarks 15
§ 5. The Apostles' Creed (Symbolum Apostolicum) 17
§ 6. The Didache or Teaching of The Twelve Apostles 19
§ 7. The so-called Epistle of Barnabas 22
§ 8. Clement of Rome 25
§ 9. Ignatius of Antioch 30
§ 10. Polycarp of Smyrna 35
§ 11. The Shepherd of Hermas 38
§ 12. Papias of Hierapolis 43


### SECOND SECTION.

### THE APOLOGETIC LITERATURE OF THE SECOND CENTURY.


§ 13. Preliminary Observations 44
§ 14. Quadratus 46
§ 15. Aristides of Athens 46
§ 16. Aristo of Pella 48
§ 17. Justin Martyr 49
§ 18. Tatian the Assyrian 57
§ 19. Miltiades. Apollinaris of Hierapolis. Melito of Sardes 61
§ 20. Athenagoras of Athens 64
§ 21. Theophilus of Antioch 65
§ 22. The Letter to Diognetus 68
§ 23. Hermias 69
§ 24. Minucius Felix 70

## THIRD SECTION.

## THE HERETICAL LITERATURE OF THE SECOND CENTURY AND THE NEW TESTAMENT APOCRYPHA.


| | | Page |
|---|---|---|
| § 25. | Gnostic Literature | 72 |
| § 26. | The Judaistic Literature | 81 |
| § 27. | The Montanist Literature | 85 |
| § 28. | The New Testament Apocrypha | 85 |
| § 29. | Apocryphal Gospels | 90 |
| § 30. | Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles | 97 |
| § 31. | Apocryphal Letters of the Apostles | 110 |
| § 32. | Apocryphal Apocalypses | 113 |


## FOURTH SECTION.

## THE ANTI-HERETICAL LITERATURE OF THE SECOND CENTURY


| | | |
|---|---|---|
| § 33. | Anti-Gnostics. Their lost works | 116 |
| § 34. | Irenæus of Lyons | 118 |
| § 35. | Anti-Montanists | 123 |
| § 36. | Writings of Ecclesiastical Authorities and Synods, chiefly concerning Heresies and Schisms | 124 |


## FIFTH SECTION.

## ECCLESIASTICAL LITERATURE DURING THE GENESIS OF CHRISTIAN THEOLOGY.

### CHAPTER I.

### THE ORIENTALS.


| | | |
|---|---|---|
| § 37. | General Considerations | 126 |


### A. THE ALEXANDRINES.


| | | |
|---|---|---|
| § 38. | Clement of Alexandria | 127 |
| § 39. | Origen | 136 |
| § 40. | Dionysius of Alexandria | 153 |
| § 41. | The later headmasters of the catechetical school of Alexandria | 157 |
| § 42. | The so-called Apostolic Church-Ordinance | 160 |


### B. SYRO-PALESTINIANS.


| | | |
|---|---|---|
| § 43. | Julius Africanus | 162 |
| § 44. | Paul of Samosata, Malchion of Antioch, Lucian of Samosata | 165 |
| § 45. | Pamphilus of Cæsarea and the Dialogus de recta in Deum fide | 166 |
| § 46. | The Didascalia apostolorum | 168 |


### C. WRITERS OF ASIA MINOR.


| | | |
|---|---|---|
| § 47. | St. Gregory Thaumaturgus (the Wonder-Worker) | 170 |
| § 48. | St. Methodius of Olympus | 175 |

CHAPTER II.

## THE WESTERN WRITERS.

Page

§ 49. General Considerations 178

### A. AFRICAN WRITERS.

§ 50. Tertullian 179
§ 51. St. Cyprian 190
§ 52. Arnobius 201
§ 53. Lactantius 203

### B. ROMAN WRITERS.

§ 54. Hippolytus 208
§ 55. Novatian 220
§ 56. Papal Letters 223

### C. OTHER WESTERN WRITERS.

§ 57. Commodian 225
§ 58. Victorinus of Pettau and Reticius of Autun 227

### APPENDIX.

§ 59. The Acts of the Martyrs 228

SECOND PERIOD.

## FROM THE BEGINNING OF THE FOURTH TO THE MIDDLE OF THE FIFTH CENTURY

FIRST SECTION.

## GREEK WRITERS.

§ 60. General conspectus 234
§ 61. Arianism, Macedonianism, Sabellianism, Apollinarianism 238
§ 62. Eusebius of Cæsarea 245
§ 63. St. Athanasius 253
§ 64. The representatives of Egyptian Monachism 264
§ 65. Anti-Manichæan writers 268
§ 66. St. Cyril of Jerusalem 271
§ 67. St. Basil the Great 274
§ 68. St. Gregory of Nazianzus, the Theologian 286
§ 69. St. Gregory of Nyssa 295
§ 70. Didymus the Blind 307
§ 71. St. Epiphanius 310
§ 72. Diodorus of Tarsus 315
§ 73. Theodore of Mopsuestia 318
§ 74. St. John Chrysostom 323
§ 75. The so-called Apostolic Constitutions 349
§ 76. Synesius of Cyrene 358

Page

§ 77. St. Cyril of Alexandria 360
§ 78. Theodoret of Cyrus 370
§ 79. Other writers of the first half of the fifth century 376

SECOND SECTION.

## SYRIAC WRITERS.

§ 80. Preliminary observations 384
§ 81. Aphraates 385
§ 82. St. Ephræm Syrus 387
§ 83. Later writers 393

THIRD SECTION.

## LATIN WRITERS.

§ 84. General conspectus 397
§ 85. Firmicus Maternus 401
§ 86. St. Hilary of Poitiers 402
§ 87. Other opponents of Arianism 412
§ 88. Poets and Historians 419
§ 89. Schisms and heresies; their defenders and opponents 425
§ 90. St. Ambrose 431
§ 91. Prudentius and Paulinus 444
§ 92. St. Sulpicius Severus and Tyrannius Rufinus 451
§ 93. St. Jerome 455
§ 94. St. Augustine 473
§ 95. Friends and disciples of St. Augustine 508
§ 96. Gallic writers 515
§ 97. Pope St. Leo the Great and other Italian writers 522

THIRD PERIOD.

# FROM THE MIDDLE OF THE FIFTH CENTURY TO THE END OF THE PATRISTIC AGE.

FIRST SECTION.

## GREEK WRITERS.

§ 98. General conspectus 529
§ 99. Writers of the second half of the fifth century 531
§ 100. Pseudo-Dionysius Areopagita 535
§ 101. Procopius of Gaza and Aeneas of Gaza 541
§ 102. Leontius of Byzantium and the emperor Justinian 544
§ 103. Historians and Geographers 552
§ 104. Hagiographers 557
§ 105. Poets 562
§ 106. Exegetes. Canonists. Ascetics 569
§ 107. Dogmatic and polemical writers 574
§ 108. St. John of Damascus 582

## SECOND SECTION.

## ARMENIAN WRITERS.


| | | Page |
|---|---|---|
| § 109. | Sketch of the early Armenian ecclesiastical literature | 589 |


## THIRD SECTION.

## LATIN WRITERS.


| | | |
|---|---|---|
| § 110. | General conspectus | 597 |
| § 111. | Faustus of Reji | 600 |
| § 112. | Other Gallic writers | 605 |
| § 113. | Irish, Spanish, and African writers | 613 |
| § 114. | Italian writers | 620 |
| § 115. | Boethius and Cassiodorius | 628 |
| § 116. | Writers in the Three Chapters controversy | 638 |
| § 117. | St. Gregory of Tours and Venantius Fortunatus | 643 |
| § 118. | Pope St. Gregory the Great | 650 |
| § 119. | St. Martin of Bracara and St. Isidore of Seville | 658 |
| | Index | 665 |

# INTRODUCTION.

## § 1. Notion and Purpose of Patrology.

1. THE FATHERS OF THE CHURCH. The word Patrology *(πατρολογία)* dates from the seventeenth century, and denoted originally the science of the lives and writings of the Fathers of the Church. «Fathers of the Church» or simply «Fathers» was the title of honour given to the ecclesiastical writers in the first era of the Church. Its use can be recognized as far back as the fifth century. In modern times the explanation of the term has been sought in the similarity of the relationship existing between a teacher and his disciple to that which is found between father and son; an interpretation apparently confirmed by such biblical parallels as the «sons of the prophets» in the Old Testament, and by passages in the New like I Cor. iv. 14. It fails, however, to do justice to the historical development of the name «Fathers». In reality, this was transferred from the bishops of the primitive Church to contemporaneous ecclesiastical writers. In the earlier centuries, by a metaphor easily understood, the bishop, in his quality of head or superior, was addressed as «Father» or «Holy Father» (e. g. Mart. S. Polyc. 12, 2: *ὁ πατὴρ τῶν χριστιανῶν*; and the inscription «Cypriano papae or papati», Cypr. Ep. 30 31 36). The authority of the bishop was both disciplinary and doctrinal. He was the depositary of the teaching office of the Church, and in matters of doubt or of controversy it was his duty to decide, as witness and judge, concerning the true faith. Since the fifth century, however, this function began to devolve (in learned discussions and conciliar proceedings) on the ecclesiastical writers of the primitive Church. Most of them, and those the more eminent, had, indeed, been bishops; but non-episcopal writers might also bear reliable witness to the contemporaneous faith of the Church, and when such testimonies dated from the earliest Christian period, they naturally enjoyed special respect and authority. The more frequently the consciousness of the primitive Church in matters of faith was appealed to in the course of doctrinal disputes, the more rapidly must so prevalent a term as «Fathers» have undergone a certain alteration. It was used to denote the witnesses to the faith

of the primitive Church, and since such witnesses were rather its writers than its bishops, the term passed from the latter to the former.

The change of meaning just alluded to will be made evident by the following instances. According to St. Athanasius (Ep. ad Afros, c. 6), the bishops of the Council of Nicæa (325) appealed to the testimony of the «Fathers» (ἐκ πατέρων ἔχοντες τὴν μαρτυρίαν) in defence of the consubstantiality of the Son with the Father; especially prominent among these «Fathers» were two early bishops (ἐπίσκοποι ἀρχαῖοι), Dionysius of Rome († 268) and Dionysius of Alexandria († 265), both of them defenders of the consubstantiality of the Son. «How can they now reject the Council of Nicæa», says Athanasius, «since even their own fathers (καὶ οἱ πατέρες αὐτῶν) subscribed its decrees?» He had just mentioned the name of the Arianizing bishop Eusebius of Cæsarea. «Whose heirs and successors are they? How can they call those men Fathers (λέγειν πατέρας) whose profession (of faith) they do not accept?» Apparently Athanasius understands by «Fathers» only bishops, especially those of the primitive Church. The bishops, and they alone, had inherited the teaching office of the Apostles. St. Augustine, in his dispute with the Pelagian Julianus of Eclanum (Contra Julian. I. 34; II. 33 36), appeals to St. Jerome as a witness for the ecclesiastical teaching concerning original sin; at the same time he is conscious of having overstepped a certain line of demarcation. To forestall his adversary's refusal to accept the evidence of Jerome, he insists that, though the latter was not a bishop, his extraordinary learning and the holiness of his life entitled him to be held a reliable interpreter of the faith of the Church. At the first session of the council of Ephesus (431), testimonies were read from the «writings of the most holy and godfearing fathers and bishops and other witnesses» (βιβλία τῶν ἁγιωτάτων καὶ ὁσιωτάτων πατέρων καὶ ἐπισκόπων καὶ ὁμολογητῶν μαρτύρων, *Mansi,* SS. Conc. Coll., iv. 1184). The «writings» quoted are exclusively those of early bishops. In his famous Commonitorium (434) St. Vincent of Lérins recommends with insistence (c. 3 33 sq.) that the faithful hold fast to the teaching of the holy Fathers; at the same time he makes it clear that he refers, not so much to the bishops, as to the ecclesiastical writers of Christian antiquity.

2. FATHERS OF THE CHURCH, ECCLESIASTICAL WRITERS, DOCTORS OF THE CHURCH. All the ancient ecclesiastical writers were not trustworthy witnesses of the faith, hence it is that posterity has not conferred on all without distinction the title of «Fathers of the Church» St. Vincent of Lérins says that, in order to try the faith of Christians, God permitted some great ecclesiastical teachers, like Origen and Tertullian, to fall into error. The true norm and rule of faith, he adds, is the concordant evidence of those Fathers who have remained true to the faith of the Church in their time, and were to the end of their lives examples of Christian virtue: «Eorum dumtaxat patrum sententiae conferendae sunt, qui in fide et communione catholica sancte, sapienter, constanter viventes, docentes et permanentes vel mori in Christo fideliter vel occidi pro Christo feliciter meruerunt.» [1] Pope Hormisdas [2] refuses to accept appeals to the Semi-Pelagian Faustus of Riez and other theologians, on the plea that they were not «Fa-

[1] Common. c. 39; cf. c. 41.

[2] Quos in auctoritatem patrum non recipit examen: Ep. 124, c. 4.

thers». Later Councils often distinguish between theological writers more or less untrustworthy and the «approved Fathers of the Church».[1] The earliest descriptive catalogue of «Fathers» whose writings merit commendation, as well as of other theological authors against whose writings people are to be warned, is found in the Decretal *De recipiendis et non recipiendis libris,* current under the name of Pope Gelasius I. (492—496). Modern patrologists indicate four criteria of a «Father of the Church»: orthodoxy of doctrine, holiness of life, ecclesiastical approval, and antiquity. All other theological writers are known as «ecclesiastici scriptores», «ecclesiae scriptores»[2]. The Fathers were not all held in equal esteem by their successors, both as writers and theologians they differ much as to place and importance in ecclesiastical antiquity. In the West four «Fathers of the Church» have been held as pre-eminent since the eighth century: Ambrose († 397), Jerome († 420), Augustine († 430), and Gregory the Great († 604), Boniface VIII. declared (1298) that he wished these four known as Doctors of the Church par excellence, and their feasts placed on a level with those of the apostles and evangelists[3]. Later popes have added other Fathers to the list of Doctors of the Church, either in liturgical documents or by special decrees. Such are, among the Latins, Hilary of Poitiers († 366), Peter Chrysologus († ca. 450), Leo the Great († 461), Isidore of Seville († 636). Among the Greeks, Athanasius († 373), Basil the Great († 379), Cyril of Jerusalem († 386), Gregory of Nazianzus († ca. 390), John Chrysostom († 407), Cyril of Alexandria († 444), John of Damascus († ca. 754), are honoured as Doctors of the Church. Some later theological writers thus distinguished are Peter Damian († 1072), Anselm of Canterbury († 1109), Bernard of Clairvaux († 1153), Thomas Aquinas († 1274), Bonaventure († 1274), Francis of Sales († 1622), and Alphonsus Liguori († 1787). In 1899 Leo XIII. declared the Venerable Bede († 735) a Doctor of the Church. The liturgical books of the Greek Church make mention of only three «great ecumenical teachers» *(οἰκουμενικοὶ μεγάλοι διδάσκαλοι)*: Basil the Great, Gregory of Nazianzum, and John Chrysostom. The patrological criteria of a «Doctor of the Church» are: orthodoxy of doctrine, holiness of life, eminent learning, and formal action of the Church: «doctrina orthodoxa, sanctitas vitae, eminens eruditio, expressa ecclesiae declaratio».

*F. Fessler,* Instit. Patrol. ed. *B. Jungmann* (Innspruck 1890), i. 15—57. On the earliest Latin Doctors of the Church cf. *C. Weyman* in Historisches Jahrbuch (1894), xv. 96 sq., and Revue d'histoire et de littérat. relig. (1898), iii. 562 sq. On the «great ecumenical teachers» of the Greeks cf. *N. Nilles*

[1] Probabiles ecclesiae patres: Conc. Lat. Rom. (649) can. 18 (*Mansi* x. 1157); *οἱ ἔγκριτοι πατέρες*: Conc. Nic. II (787) act. 6 (*Mansi* xiii. 313).

[2] *St. Jerome,* De viris illustr., prol.

[3] Egregios ipsius doctores ecclesiae: c. un., in vi., de reliquiis 3, 22.

in Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie (1894), xviii. 742 sq.; *E. Bondy,* Les Pères de l'Église in Revue Augustinienne (1904), pp. 461—486.

3. THE PATRISTIC EPOCH. As late as the fifth century even very recent writers could be counted among the «holy Fathers». Among the «most holy and godfearing Fathers» whose writings were read in the first session of the Council of Ephesus (June 22., 431)[1] were Theophilus of Alexandria († 412) and Atticus of Constantinople († 425). In the list of patristic citations, «paternae auctoritates», appended by Leo the Great to his Letter to Flavian of Constantinople (June 13., 449)[2] there are passages from Augustine († 430) and from Cyril of Alexandria († 444). The later Christian centuries tended more and more to confine this honourable title to the ecclesiastical writers of antiquity. It was applied to them not so much on account of their antiquity as on account of their authority, which, in turn, had its root in their antiquity. The «Fathers» of the first centuries are and remain in a special way the authentic interpreters of the thoughts and sentiments of the primitive Christians. In their writings were set down for all time documentary testimonies to the primitive conception of the faith. Though modern Christian sects have always denounced the Catholic principle of «tradition», they have been compelled, by the logic of things, to seek in ecclesiastical antiquity for some basis or countenance of their own mutually antagonistic views. The limits of Christian antiquity could not, of course, be easily fixed; they remain even yet somewhat indistinct. The living current of historical, and particularly of intellectual life, always defies any immovable time-boundaries. Most modern manuals of Patrology draw the line for the Greek Church at the death of John of Damascus († ca. 754), for the Latin Church at the death of Gregory the Great († 604). For Latin ecclesiastical literature the limit should be stretched to the death of Isidore of Seville († 636). Like his Greek counterpart, John Damascene, Isidore was a very productive writer, and thoroughly penetrated with the sense of his office as a frontiersman between the old and the new.

The teachings of the Fathers of the Church are among the original sources of Catholic doctrine. On the reasons for the same and the extent to which the patristic writings may be drawn upon for the proof of Catholic teaching cf. *Fessler-Jungmann,* op. cit., i. 41—57

4. PURPOSE OF PATROLOGY. Though the science of Patrology takes its name from the Fathers of the Church, it includes also the ecclesiastical writers of antiquity Thereby, the field of its labours is enlarged, and it becomes possible to deal with ecclesiastical literature as a whole. The purpose of this science is to produce a history of the early ecclesiastical literature, that is, of such ancient

[1] *Mansi,* iv. 1184—1196. [2] Ib., vi. 961—972.

theological literature as arose on the basis of the teachings of the Church. In the peculiar and unique significance of this literature, Patrology finds the justification of such a narrow limitation of its subject-matter. Though this science does not ignore the distinction between the human and the divine in the books of the New Testament, it confides the study of these writings to Biblical Introduction, convinced that it would otherwise be obliged to confine itself to such a treatment of the same as would be unjust to inspired documents that contain revelation. Patrology might, strictly speaking, ignore the anti-Christian and anti-ecclesiastical, or heretical, writings of antiquity; nevertheless, it finds it advantageous to pay constant attention to them. At the proper time, it becomes the duty of the patrologist, in his quality of historian of Christian doctrine, to exhibit the genetic growth of his subject. The development of early ecclesiastical literature was conditioned and influenced in a notable degree by the literary conflict against paganism, Judaism and heresy. The earliest ecclesiastical writers enter the lists precisely as defenders of Christianity against formal literary assaults. We do not accept as accurate a modern definition of Patrology as «the literary history of early Christianity». From that point of view, it would have to include even the profane works of Christian writers, and become the Christian equivalent of heathen and Jewish literature. Moreover, it is not so much the profession of Christianity on the part of the writer as the theologico-ecclesiastical character of his work that brings it within the range of Patrology, and stamps upon it for all time something peculiar and distinctive. If we must no longer use the word Patrology, the science may well be defined as the history of early ecclesiastical literature. The considerations that affect the selection of the material, and the limitations of Patrology affect also the treatment of the subject-matter. Stress is laid more on the theological point of view, on the contents of the patristic writings, than on mere literary form. It is true that literary history has a distinctly artistic interest. In general, however, the writings of the Fathers are not literary art-work; they expressly avoid such a character. Until very lately a distinction was drawn between Patrology and «Patristic». To the latter, it was said, belonged the study of the doctrinal content of the early Christian writers. The word «Patristic» comes from the «theologia patristica» of former Protestant manuals of dogmatic theology that were wont to contain a special section devoted to the opinions of the Fathers. This was called «theologia patristica», and distinguished from «theologia biblica» and «theologia symbolica». In the latter half of the eighteenth century this «theologia patristica» gave way among Protestants to a specific history of dogma, destined to illustrate the constant development and evolution of the original apostolic teaching. Thereby, the special office of «Patristic» was exhausted. There

remains, therefore, no longer any good reason for withdrawing from Patrology the description of the doctrines of the Fathers, and confining it to an account of their lives and deeds. With the loss of its subject-matter, the raison d'être of «Patristic» disappears. — In the last few decades, all former expositions of Patrology have suffered severe reproaches both from friend and foe. Broadly considered, such reproaches were both reasonable and just. It is proper that in the future Patrology should develop along the line of scientific history, should grasp more firmly and penetrate more deeply its own subject-matter, should first digest, and then exhibit in a scientific and philosophic way, the mass of literary-historical facts that come within its purview. In other words, its office is no longer limited to the study, in themselves alone, of the writings of individual Fathers, or of individual writings of the Fathers; it must also set forth the active forces that are common to all, and the relations of all to their own world and their own time.

*Fr. Nitzsch,* Geschichtliches und Methodologisches zur Patristik: Jahrbücher für deutsche Theologie (1865), x. 37—63. Nitzsch uses the term Patristic as identical with Patrology. *Fr. Overbeck,* Über die Anfänge der patristischen Literatur· Historische Zeitschrift (new series) (1882), xii. 417—472. *A. Ehrhard,* Zur Behandlung der Patrologie Literarischer Handweiser, 1895, 601—608. *J. Haussleiter,* Der Aufbau der altchristlichen Literatur· Götting. Gelehrte Anzeigen (Berlin, 1898).

5. MODERN HISTORY OF EARLY CHRISTIAN LITERATURE. Modern Protestant and Rationalist scholars have created in the place of Patrology a history of early Christian literature, the purpose of which is to investigate and criticize, independently of its theological or ecclesiastical aspects, the entire intellectual product of Christian antiquity from a purely literary standpoint. They have been led to this transformation, or rather rejection of Patrology, not so much by general scientific principles, as by the hypotheses of modern rationalistic Protestantism, foremost among which is the denial of the supernatural origin of Christianity and the Church. According to them, the so-called Catholic Church was not founded by Jesus Christ. It was only after a long evolutionary period, during which the Gospel of Christ underwent steadily a number of profoundly modifying influences in the sense of paganism, and particularly of hellenism, that the Catholic Church appeared among men toward the end of the second century. Since that time, both this Church and its doctrines have been at all times the subject of the most far-reaching changes and the most inconsistent innovations. The so-called Fathers of the Church represent only their own personal and very mutable opinions. There is no more objective difference between ecclesiastical and non-ecclesiastical, orthodox and heretical teaching, than between the inspired and non-inspired books of the Scriptures, etc.

It is this view of early ecclesiastical literature (in the first three centuries) that predominates in the works of *A. Harnack* and *G. Krüger* (cf. § 2, 4).

### § 2. History and Literature of Patrology.

1. ST. JEROME. — We owe to St. Jerome the idea of a Patrology or history of Christian theological literature. His work on the Christian writers was composed at Bethlehem in 392 at the suggestion of the pretorian prefect Dexter[1] It is modelled on the homonymous work of Suetonius (ca. 75—160), and professes to be a brief account of all those «ecclesiastical writers» («ecclesiae scriptores») who have written on the Sacred Scriptures («de scripturis sanctis aliquid memoriae prodiderunt») from the Crucifixion to the fourteenth year of the reign of Theodosius (392). The first chapters are devoted to the books of the New Testament; later on, even heretical writers are added (Bardesanes c. 33, Novatian c. 70, and others). At the end (c. 135) he gives an account of his own writings as far as the year 392. The material of the first chapters is taken from the New Testament; the following sections, on the Greek writers of the first three centuries, are hastily made and inaccurate excerpts from the Church History of Eusebius of Cæsarea. The chapters on the Latin writers and on later Greek writers represent the personal knowledge and research of St. Jerome, and although they do not entirely satisfy our just expectations, they are nevertheless an historical authority of the first rank. Erasmus, who first edited (1516) the «De viris illustribus», published also a Greek translation of the work (*Migne* l. c.) which he attributed to Sophronius, a contemporary of St. Jerome. It was not, however, executed before the seventh century

In the very numerous manuscripts of this work of St. Jerome the continuation by *Gennadius* (n. 2) is usually found. It is also printed in the latest editions, by *W Herding,* Leipzig, 1879; *C. A. Bernoulli,* Sammlung ausgewählter kirchen- und dogmengeschichtlicher Quellenschriften xi., Freiburg i. Br. (1895), and *E. C. Richardson,* Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur, Leipzig, 1896, xiv. 1. These editions have not rendered further improvement impossible. *O. v. Gebhardt* has given us an excellent edition of the Greek translation, Leipzig, 1896 (Texte und Untersuchungen l. c.). Cf. *St. v. Sychowski,* Hieronymus als Literarhistoriker, Münster, 1894 (Kirchengeschichtliche Studien, ii. 2); *C. A. Bernoulli,* Der Schriftstellerkatalog des Hieronymus, Freiburg i. Br., 1895; *G. Wentzel,* Die griechische Übersetzung der Viri inlustres des Hieronymus, Leipzig, 1895 (Texte und Untersuchungen, xiii. 3).

2. CONTINUATORS OF ST. JEROME. — For more than a thousand years, this little book of the Hermit of Bethlehem served as the basis of all later efforts to produce a history of theological literature. All later compilers linked their work to his, and even when

[1] De viris illustr.: *Migne,* PL., xxiii. 601—720.

there was added a name forgotten by him, or by one of his continuators, the form and divisions of the work remained unchanged. Between the years 467—480 (apparently), Gennadius, a priest of Marseilles, brought out a very useful continuation and completion of the «De viris» [1] He was a Semi-Pelagian, a fact that is responsible for occasional deviations from his usual impartial or *objective* attitude. Otherwise, Gennadius was an historian of extensive knowledge, accurate judgment and honourable purpose. Isidore, archbishop of Seville († 636), added considerably to the labours of Gennadius [2], and his disciple Ildephonsus of Toledo († 667) contributed a short appendix on some Spanish theologians [3]. Centuries were now to pass away before the Benedictine chronicler, Sigebert of Gembloux in Belgium († 1112), took up the task once more, and carried the history of ecclesiastical literature down to his own time. In his book «De viris illustribus» [4] he treats first, «imitatus Hieronymum et Gennadium», as he himself says (c. 171), of the ancient ecclesiastical writers; and next gives biographical and bibliographical notes on early mediæval Latin theologians, usually slight and meagre in contents, and not unfrequently rather superficial. Somewhat similar compendia were composed by the priest Honorius of Augustodunum (Autun?) between 1122 and 1125 [5], by the «Anonymus Mellicensis», so called from the Benedictine abbey of Melk in Lower Austria, where the first manuscript of his work was found, though the work itself was probably composed in the abbey of Prüfening near Ratisbon in 1135 [6], and by the author of a similarly entitled work wrongly ascribed to the scholastic theologian Henry of Ghent († 1293). These compilations were all surpassed, in 1494, as regards the number of authors and the abundance of information, by the «De scriptoribus ecclesiasticis» of the celebrated abbot Johannes Trithemius († 1516). It contains notices of 963 writers, some of whom, however, were not theologians. Its chief merit lies in the information given concerning writers of the later period of Christian antiquity. For Trithemius, as for his predecessors, St. Jerome and Gennadius are the principal sources of knowledge concerning the literary labours of the Fathers.

These literary-historical compilations are to be found together with the work of St. Jerome (Latin and Greek) in *J. A. Fabricius,* Bibliotheca ecclesiastica, Hamburg, 1718. For the later editions of Gennadius by *Herding, Bernoulli, Richardson* see p. 7; cf. also *Jungmann,* Quaestiones Gennadianae (Programme), Lipsiae, 1881; *Br. Czapla,* Gennadius als Literarhistoriker, Münster, 1898 (Kirchengeschichtliche Studien, iv. 1); *Fr. Diekamp,* Wann hat Gennadius seinen Schriftstellerkatalog verfaßt? Römische Quartalschrift für christliche Altertumskunde und für Kirchengeschichte, 1898, xii.

[1] *Migne,* PL., lviii. 1059—1120. [2] Ib., lxxxiii. 1081—1106.
[3] Ib., xcvi. 195—206. [4] Ib., clx. 547—588.
[5] De luminaribus ecclesiae: *Migne,* PL., clxxii. 197—234.
[6] De scriptoribus ecclesiasticis: ib., ccxiii. 961—984.

411—420. For the two Spanish historians of Christian literature cf. *G. v. Dzialowski,* Isidor und Ildefons als Literarhistoriker, Münster (Kirchengeschichtliche Studien, iv. 2). For Sigebert of Gembloux cf. *Wattenbach,* Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen im Mittelalter, 6. ed., Berlin, 1893—1894, ii. 155—162, and for his literary-historical work *S. Hirsch,* De vita et scriptis Sigeberti monachi Gemblacensis, Berolini, 1841, 330—337. There is an article by *Stanonik* on Honorius of Augustodunum in the Kirchenlexikon of *Wetzer* und *Welte,* 2. ed., vi. 268—274. A good edition of the «Anonymus Mellicensis» was published by *E. Ettlinger,* Karlsruhe, 1896. For the work «De viris illustribus» current under the name of Henry of Ghent see *B. Hauréau* in Mémoires de l'institut national de France, Acad. des inscriptions et belles-lettres, Paris, 1883, xxx. 2, 349—357. The work of Trithemius is discussed by *J. Silbernagl,* Johannes Trithemius, 2. ed., Regensburg, 1885, pp. 59—65.

3. THE XVI., XVII., AND XVIII. CENTURIES. Since the fifteenth century the study of ecclesiastical literature has made unexpected progress. The humanists brought to light a multitude of unknown works of Latin, and especially of Greek ecclesiastical writers. The contention of the reformers that primitive Christianity had undergone a profound corruption, furthered still more the already awakened interest in the ancient literature of the Church. In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, the Benedictine scholars of the French Congregation of St. Maur gave a powerful and lasting impulse to the movement by the excellent, and in part classical, editions of texts, in which they revealed to an astonished world historical sources of almost infinite richness and variety. New provinces and new purposes were thereby opened to Patrology. The Maurists made known at the same time the laws for the historical study of the original sources; in nearly every department of ancient ecclesiastical literature, it became possible for scholars to strip the historical truth of the veil of legend that had hung over it. It still remained customary for literary historians, to deal with the ancient ecclesiastical literature as a whole. The most distinguished Catholic names in this period of patrological scholarship are those of Bellarmine († 1621), Dupin († 1719), Le Nourry († 1724), Ceillier († 1761), Schram († 1797), Lumper († 1800). Among the Protestant patrologists are reckoned the Reformed theologians Cave († 1713), and Oudin († 1717), a Premonstratensian monk who became a Protestant in 1690). The Lutheran writers, Gerhard († 1637), Hülsemann († 1661), Olearius († 1711), and others introduced and spread the use of the term «Patrology», meaning thereby a comprehensive view of all Christian theological literature from the earliest period to mediæval, and even to modern times.

*Robertus* Card. *Bellarminus* S. J., De scriptoribus ecclesiasticis liber unus, cum adiunctis indicibus undecim et brevi chronologia ab orbe condito usque ad annum 1612, Romae, 1613; Coloniae, 1613, et saepius. *L. E. Dupin,* Nouvelle bibliothèque des auteurs ecclésiastiques, Paris, 1686 sq. The several sections of this extensive work appeared under different titles. The number of volumes also varies according to the editions. Because of

its very unecclesiastical character the work of Dupin was placed on the Index, May 10. 1757. *N. Le Nourry* O. S. B., Apparatus ad bibliothecam maximam veterum patrum et antiquorum scriptorum ecclesiasticorum Lugduni (1677) editam, 2 tomi, Paris, 1703—1715. *R. Ceillier* O. S. B., Histoire générale des auteurs sacrés et ecclésiastiques, 23 vols., Paris, 1729—1763; a new edition was brought out at Paris, 1858—1869, 16 vols. *D. Schram* O. S. B., Analysis operum SS. Patrum et scriptorum eccl., 18 tomi, Aug. Vind., 1780—1796. *G. Lumper* O. S. B., Historia theologico-critica de vita, scriptis atque doctrina SS. Patrum aliorumque scriptorum eccl. trium primorum saeculorum, 13 tomi, Aug. Vind., 1783—1799.

*G. Cave,* Scriptorum ecclesiasticorum historia litteraria a Christo nato usque ad saec. XIV, Lond., 1688. *C. Oudin,* Commentarius de scriptoribus eccles., 3 tomi, Lipsiae, 1722.

*Joh. Gerhardi* Patrologia, s. de primitivae ecclesiae christianae doctorum vita ac lucubrationibus opusculum posthumum, Jenae, 1653; 3. ed., Gerae, 1673. *J. Hülsemann,* Patrologia, ed. *J. A. Scherzer,* Lipsiae, 1670. *J. G. Olearius,* Abacus patrologicus, Jenae, 1673. *Idem,* Bibliotheca scriptorum eccles., 2 tomi, Jenae, 1710—1711.

Many ancient ecclesiastical writers are treated at much length by *L. S. le Nain de Tillemont,* Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire ecclésiastique des six premiers siècles, 16 tomes, Paris, 1693—1712, often reprinted; cf. also *J. A. Fabricius,* Bibliotheca Graeca seu notitia scriptorum veterum Graecorum, 14 voll., Hamburgi, 1705—1728. A new, but unfinished edition of Fabricius was published by *G. Chr. Harles,* 12 voll., Hamburg, 1790—1809. *C. Tr. G. Schoenemann* Bibliotheca historico-literaria Patrum latinorum, 2 tomi, Lipsiae, 1792—1794.

4. PATROLOGY IN MODERN TIMES. During the nineteenth century, the materials of ancient ecclesiastical literary history have steadily increased. Not only have many new Greek and Latin texts been discovered, notably by such scholars as Cardinal Mai († 1854) and Cardinal Pitra († 1889), but entirely new fields have been thrown open, particularly in the domain of the ancient Syriac and Armenian literatures; the elaboration of this material has called forth, especially in Germany, England, and North America, a zeal that grows ever more active and general. Protestant theologians paid particular attention to the problems of Christian antiquity, and classical philologians learned to overcome their former attitude of depreciation of theologico-Christian literature. The press poured forth patristic monographs in such numbers that their ever-growing flood became at times almost a source of embarrassment. Among the comprehensive works published by Catholic authors were those of Möhler († 1838), Permaneder († 1862), Fessler († 1872), Alzog († 1878), Nirschl, and others. In the latter half of the eighteenth century the custom arose of dividing the later from the earlier Fathers, and making these latter the subject of a separate branch of literary and historical study Within the last few years, Protestant theologians have made exhaustive studies on the writers of the first three centuries. In the first part of his monumental work, Adolf Harnack has presented with an unexampled fulness the entire material of pre-Eusebian Christian literature.

*J. A. Möhler,* Patrologie oder christliche Literärgeschichte, edited by *F. X. Reithmayr,* vol. 1 (the first three Christian centuries), Ratisbon 1840. The work was not continued. *M. Permaneder,* Bibliotheca patristica, Landishuti, 1841—1844, 2 tomi. *J. Fessler,* Institutiones Patrologiae, Innspruck, 1850—1851, 2 tomi; denuo recensuit, auxit, edidit *B. Jungmann,* ib., 1890—1896. *J. Alzog,* Grundriß der Patrologie oder der älteren christlichen Literärgeschichte, Freiburg, 1866, 4. ed., ib. 1888. *J. Nirschl,* Lehrbuch der Patrologie und Patristik, Mainz, 1881—1885, 3 vols. *J. Rézbányay,* Compendium patrologiae et patristicae, Quinqueecclesiis [i. e. Fünfkirchen], 1894. *B. Swete,* Patristic Study, London, 1902.

*Ch. Th. Cruttwell,* A literary history of early Christianity, including the Fathers and the chief heretical writers of the Ante-Nicene period, London, 1893, 2 vols. *A. Harnack,* Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur bis auf Eusebius, I. Part: Die Überlieferung und der Bestand, Leipzig, 1893. II. Part: Die Chronologie, 1. vol.: Die Chronologie der altchristlichen Literatur bis Irenäus, Leipzig, 1897; 2. vol. Die Chronologie der Literatur von Irenäus bis Eusebius, ib., 1904. *G. Krüger,* Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten, Freiburg, 1895; with supplement, 1897: English transl. by *Gillet,* History of Early Christian Literature, New York and London, 1897.

*P Batiffol,* La littérature grecque, Paris, 1897 (Bibliothèque de l'enseignement de l'histoire ecclésiastique. Anciennes littératures chrétiennes). The Greek theologians of the Byzantine period (527—1453) are treated by *A. Ehrhard* in *K. Krumbacher,* Geschichte der byzantinischen Literatur, 2. ed., Munich, 1897, pp. 37—218. For the Greek hymnology of the same period cf. ib. pp. 653—705. The histories of Roman literature, by *Bähr, Teuffel-Schwabe,* and *Schanz,* devote attention to the Latin theological writers: *J. Chr. F. Bähr,* Geschichte der römischen Literatur, vol. iv: Die christlich-römische Literatur, Karlsruhe, 1836—1840; *W. S. Teuffel,* Geschichte der römischen Literatur, neu bearbeitet von *L. Schwabe,* 5. ed., Leipzig, 1890, 2 vols.; *M. Schanz,* Geschichte der römischen Literatur, 3. Part: Die Zeit von Hadrian (117) bis auf Konstantin (324), Munich, 1896, 2. ed. 1905. 4. Part, 1. Half: Die Literatur des 4. Jahrhunderts, 1904. Cf. especially *A. Ebert,* Allgemeine Geschichte der Literatur des Mittelalters im Abendlande, vol. i: Geschichte der christlich-lateinischen Literatur von ihren Anfängen bis zum Zeitalter Karls des Großen, Leipzig, 1874, 2. ed. 1889. Much less satisfactory is the work of *M. Manitius,* Geschichte der christlich-lateinischen Poesie bis zur Mitte des 18. Jahrhunderts, Stuttgart, 1891. In the proper place will be mentioned the descriptions of ancient Syriac and Armenian literature. The work of *Smith* and *Wace* is very useful, relatively complete and generally reliable A Dictionary of Christian Biography, Literature, Sects and Doctrines, edited by *W. Smith* and *H. Wace,* London, 1877—1887, 4 vols. *O. Bardenhewer,* Geschichte der altkirchl. Literatur, I.—II. tom.: Bis zum Beginn des 4. Jahrhunderts, Freiburg, 1902—1903.

### § 3. Literary collections relative to the Fathers of the Church. Collective editions of their writings. Principal collections of translations.

1. *S. F. W. Hoffmann,* Bibliographisches Lexikon der gesamten Literatur der Griechen, 2. ed., Leipzig, 1838—1845, 3 vols. *W. Engelmann,* Bibliotheca scriptorum classicorum, 8. ed., containing the literature from 1700—1878, revised by *E. Preuß,* Leipzig, 1880—1882, 2 vols. *Ulisse Chevalier,* Répertoire des sources historiques du moyen âge, vol. 1: Bio-Bibliographie, Paris, 1877—1886, with a supplement, Paris, 1888, 2. ed. 1904. *E. C. Richardson,* Bibliographical synopsis, in the Ante-Nicene

Fathers, Supplement, Buffalo, 1897, pp. 1—136 (see n. 3). *A. Ehrhard,* Die altchristliche Literatur und ihre Erforschung seit 1880. Allgemeine Übersicht und erster Literaturbericht (1880—1884), Freiburg (Straßburger theol. Studien 1, 4—5). *Id.,* Die altchristliche Literatur und ihre Erforschung von 1884 bis 1900. I. Die vornicänische Literatur, Freiburg, 1900 (Straßburger theol. Studien, Supplem. I). *Bardenhewer,* Geschichte der altkirchlichen Literatur, Freiburg, 1902—1903, vol. i—ii. The literary compilations descriptive of the Syriac patristic literature are discussed in § 80—83.

2. The principal editions of the Fathers are the following: *M. de la Bigne,* Bibliotheca SS. Patrum supra ducentos, Paris., 1575, 8 voll., with an appendix, ib. 1579; 6. ed., ib. 1654, 17 voll.

Magna Bibliotheca veterum Patrum et antiquorum scriptorum ecclesiasticorum, opera et studio doctissimorum in Alma Universitate Colon. Agripp. theologorum ac professorum, Colon. Agr., 1618, 14 voll., *with a* Supplementum vel appendix, ib. 1622.

*Fr. Combefis,* Graeco-Latinae Patrum Bibliothecae novum auctarium, Paris., 1648, 2 voll.; *Id.,* Bibliothecae Graecorum Patrum auctarium novissimum, ib. 1672, 2 voll.

*L. d'Achéry,* Veterum aliquot scriptorum qui in Galliae bibliothecis, maxime Benedictinorum, supersunt Spicilegium, Paris., 1655—1677, 13 voll.; new edition by *L. Fr. J. de la Barre,* Paris, 1723, 3 voll. It has been proved lately that d'Achéry included, in good faith, several documents forged by the Oratorian *Jérôme Vignier* († 1661); the proof is clearest for just those pieces that were held to be the special pride of the collection. Cf. *J. Havet,* Les découvertes de Jérôme Vignier: Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes, Paris, 1885, xlvi. 205—271.

Maxima Bibliotheca veterum Patrum antiquorumque ecclesiae scriptorum, Lugduni, 1677, 27 voll.

*J. B. Cotelier,* Ecclesiae Graecae monumenta, Paris 1677—1686, 3 voll. In some copies the Analecta Graeca of *B. de Montfaucon* (Paris, 1688) are called the fourth volume of the Cotelier collection.

*A. Gallandi,* Bibliotheca veterum Patrum antiquorumque scriptorum ecclesiasticorum, Venetiis, 1765—1781 et 1788, 14 voll. Index alphabeticus Bibliothecae Gallandii, Bononiae, 1863.

*M. J. Routh,* Reliquiae Sacrae seu Auctorum fere jam perditorum secundi tertiique saeculi fragmenta quae supersunt. Accedunt epistolae synodicae et canonicae Nicaeno concilio antiquiores, Oxonii, 1814—1818, 4 voll., ed. altera, 1846—1848, 5 voll.

*A. Mai,* Scriptorum veterum nova Collectio e Vaticanis codicibus edita, Romae, 1825—1838, 10 voll. *Id.,* Classici auctores e Vaticanis codicibus editi, ib. 1828—1838, 10 voll. *Id.,* Spicilegium Romanum, ib. 1839—1844, 10 voll. *Id.,* Nova Patrum Bibliotheca, ib. 1844—1854, 7 voll.; tom. viii—ix, ed. *J. Cozza-Luzi,* ib. 1871—1888.

Patrologiae cursus completus. Accurante *J. P. Migne,* Paris., 1844 ad 1866. It consists of a Greek and a Latin series. The Latin Fathers were published between 1844 and 1855, and come down to Innocent III. († 1216), in 217 vols., with Indices in four vols. (218—221). The Greek Fathers were published from 1857 to 1866 and reach to the Council of Florence (1438—1439). The latter series is without Indices. *D. Scholarios* published at Athens, 1879, a Catalogue of the Greek writings in the Migne edition, and of those in the Corpus scriptorum historiae Byzantinae (Bonn, 1828—1855, 48 vols.), also some fascicules of a broadly conceived index to both these series of Greek writers, Athens, 1883—1887 A short catalogue of the authors printed in the Migne series of Greek Fathers may be found in *A. Potthast,* Bibliotheca historica medii aevi, 2. ed., Berlin, 1896, CI—CVI.

*J. B. Pitra,* Spicilegium Solesmense complectens SS. Patrum scriptorumque ecclesiasticorum anecdota hactenus opera, Paris, 1852—1858, 4 voll. *Id.,* Juris ecclesiastici Graecorum historia et monumenta, Romae, 1864—1868, 2 voll. *Id.,* Analecta sacra Spicilegio Solesmensi parata, Paris, 1876—1891, 6 voll. *Id.,* Analecta sacra et classica Spicil. Solesm. parata, ib. 1888. His Analecta novissima (ib. 1885—1888, 2 voll.) contain, with the exception of some papal letters in the first volume, only mediæval documents.

Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum latinorum, editum consilio et impensis Academiae Litterarum Caesareae Vindobonensis, 1866 sqq.

SS. Patrum opuscula selecta ad usum praesertim studiosorum theologiae. Edidit et commentariis auxit *H. Hurter* S. J., Innspruck, 1868—1885, 48 voll. Most of the volumes went through several editions. Series altera, ib. 1884—1892, 6 voll.

Monumenta Germaniae historica. Inde ab anno Christi quingentesimo usque ad annum millesimum et quingentesimum edidit Societas aperiendis fontibus rerum Germanicarum medii aevi. Auctores antiquissimi, Berol. 1877—1898, 13 voll. This section of the Monumenta, formerly edited by *Mommsen,* includes the Latin writers of the transition period from the Roman to the Teutonic era.

Sammlung ausgewählter kirchen- und dogmengeschichtlicher Quellenschriften, als Grundlage für Seminarübungen herausgegeben unter Leitung von *G. Krüger,* Freiburg, 1891 sq.

*G. Rauschen,* Florilegium patristicum. Digessit, vertit, adnotavit G. R. Fasc. i. Monumenta aevi apostolici. Fasc. ii. S. Justini apologiae duae. Fasc. iii: Monumenta minora saeculi secundi. Bonnae, 1904—1905.

Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte, herausgegeben von der Kirchenväter-Kommission der königl. preußischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Leipzig 1897 ff.

Two editions now in progress of select works by Fathers may be mentioned. One is the «Cambridge Patristic Texts» Of this series two volumes have appeared, viz.: «The five Theological Orations of Gregory of Nazianzus«, ed. Mason, 1899; «The Catechetical Oration of Gregory of Nyssa», ed. Srawley, 1903. «The Letters and other Remains of Dionysius of Alexandria», ed. Feltre, 1904.

The other collection is «Bibliotheca Sanctorum Patrum, theologiae tironibus et universo clero accommodata», Vizzini etc., Romae, 1901 sqq. Thirteen vols. of this series have been issued. It should be observed that in it all Greek works are accompanied by a Latin translation.

For more detailed information as to the contents of the older collective editions of the Fathers cf. *Th. Ittig,* De Bibliothecis et Catenis Patrum variisque veterum scriptorum ecclesiasticorum collectionibus, Lipsiae, 1707 *J. G. Dowling,* Notitia scriptorum SS. Patrum aliorumque veteris ecclesiae monumentorum, quae in collectionibus Anecdotorum post a. Chr. 1700 in lucem editis continentur, Oxonii, 1839. The collective editions of the Syriac Fathers are described in §§ 80—83.

3. COLLECTIONS OF TRANSLATIONS. Among the principal collections of translations the following deserve mention:

Bibliothek der Kirchenväter. Auswahl der vorzüglichsten patristischen Werke in deutscher Übersetzung unter der Oberleitung von *Fr. X. Reithmayr,* fortgesetzt von *B. Thalhofer,* Kempten, 1860—1888, 80 voll.

Library of the Fathers, edited by *Pusey, Keble* and *Newman,* Oxford, 1838—1888, 45 voll. The Ante-Nicene Christian Library. Translations of the writings of the Fathers down to A. D. 325, edited by *A. Roberts* and

*J. Donaldson,* Edinburgh, 1866--1872, 24 voll., with a supplementary volume, ed. by *A. Menzies,* ib. 1897. This collection of translations was reprinted at Buffalo, 1884—1886, under the direction of *A. Cleveland Coxe,* 8 voll. with a supplement, 1887 (New York, 1896, 10 voll.). For the bibliography of English translations of the Ante-Nicene Fathers see *Ernest C. Richardson* (ib. vol. x): Bibliographical Synopsis, passim.

*Ph. Schaff* and *H. Wace,* A select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church. In connection with a number of patristic scholars of Europe and America. Buffalo and New York, 1886—1890, 14 voll. Second Series, New York, 1890 sq.

FIRST PERIOD.

# FROM THE END OF THE FIRST TO THE BEGINNING OF THE FOURTH CENTURY

## FIRST SECTION.

## PRIMITIVE ECCLESIASTICAL LITERATURE.

### § 4. Preliminary Remarks.

The primitive Christians were in general disinclined to literary composition. The Gospel was preached to the poor (Mt. 11, 5), and »not in the persuasive words of human wisdom, but in shewing of the spirit and power» (1 Cor. 2, 4). The Apostles wrote only under the pressure of external circumstances; even in later times living oral instruction remained the regular means of transmission and propagation of the Christian truth.

Apart from the books of the New Testament, we possess but very few literary remains of the apostolic and sub-apostolic period. Among the most ancient are the Apostles' Creed, and the «Doctrine of the Twelve Apostles» discovered in 1883; both owe their origin to the practical needs of the primitive Christian communities. There are, moreover, some Letters, at once the outcome of the pastoral zeal of the ecclesiastical authorities and echoes of the apostolic Epistles.

The authors of these Letters, and a few other ecclesiastical writers of the second century, are usually known as the Apostolic Fathers. J. B. Cotelier († 1686) was the first to give the title of «Patres aevi apostolici» to the author of the so-called Epistle of Barnabas, Clement of Rome, Hermas, Ignatius of Antioch, and Polycarp. Later on Papias of Hierapolis and the author of the Epistle to Diognetus were included in the series. There is really no intimate relationship between these writings. The work of Hermas is an exhortation to penance in the shape of a vision. Of the work of Papias only meagre fragments have reached us, quite useless for any clear intelligence of its original form; while the author of the Epistle to Diognetus, in view of its tendency and form, more properly belongs to the apologists.

Among the collective editions of the writings of the Apostolic Fathers the following are the most important. Patres aevi apostolici sive SS. Patrum,

qui temporibus apostolicis floruerunt, Barnabae, Clementis Rom., Hermae, Ignatii, Polycarpi, opera edita et inedita, vera et suppositita, una cum Clementis, Ignatii et Polycarpi actis atque martyriis. Ex mss. codicibus eruit, correxit versionibusque et notis illustravit *J. B. Cotelerius*, Paris., 1672, 2 vol. A new edition was issued by *J. Clericus*, Antwerp, 1698, and Amsterdam, 1724, and was reprinted, with the fragments of Papias and the Epistle to Diognetus added, in *Gallandi*, Bibl. vet. Patr., I—III, Venetiis, 1765—1767; also in *Migne*, PG. i. 11 v, Paris., 1857. — Opera Patrum apostolicorum ed. *C. J. Hefele*, Tübingen, 1839, 4. ed. 1855. Opp. Patr. apostol., textum recensuit, adnotationibus criticis, exegeticis, historicis illustravit, versionem latinam, prolegomena, indices addidit *F. X. Funk*. Ed. post Hefelianam quartam quinta. Vol. i: Epistulae Barnabae, Clementis Romani, Ignatii, Polycarpi, Anonymi ad Diognetum, Ignatii et Polycarpi martyria, Pastor Hermae, Tübingen, 1878; ed. nova Doctrina duodecim Apostolorum adaucta. 1887. Vol. ii: Clementis R. epistulae de virginitate eiusdemque martyrium, epistulae Pseudo-Ignatii, Ignatii martyria tria ., Papiae et seniorum apud Irenaeum fragmenta, Polycarpi vita, 1881. A second edition of *Funk's* work appeared at Tübingen 1901, 2 voll. (Patres Apostolici, i. Doctrina duodecim Apostolorum, Epistulae Barnabae, Clementis Romani, Ignatii, Polycarpi huiusque martyrium, Papiae, Quadrati, presbyterorum apud Irenaeum fragmenta, Epistola ad Diognetum, Pastor Hermae; ii: Clementis Romani epistulae de virginitate eiusdemque martyrium, Epistulae Pseudo-Ignatii, Ignatii martyria, fragmenta Polycarpiana, Polycarpi vita). *F. X. Funk*, Die apostolischen Väter (Sammlung ausgewählter kirchen- und dogmengeschichtl. Quellenschriften, ed. *Krüger*, 2. series I), Tübingen, 1901. — Patrum apostolicorum opera ed. *A. R. M. Dressel*, Lipsiae, 1857, 2. ed. 1863. — Patrum apostol. opera, textum recensuerunt, commentario exeg. et histor. illustraverunt, apparatu critico, versione lat., prolegg., indicibus instruxerunt *O. de Gebhardt*, *Ad. Harnack*, *Th. Zahn*, ed. post Dresselianam alteram tertia. Fasc. i. Barnabae epist. Graece et Lat., Clementis R. epp. recens. atque illustr., Papiae quae supersunt, Presbyterorum reliquias ab Irenaeo servatas, vetus Ecclesiae Rom. symbolum, ep. ad Diognetum adiecerunt *O. de Gebhardt* et *Ad. Harnack*, Lipsiae, 1875. Fasc. i, part. i, 2. ed. Clementis R. epp., textum ad fidem codicum et Alexandrini et Constantinopolitani nuper inventi rec. et ill. *O. de Gebhardt* et *Ad. Harnack*, 1876. Fasc. i, part. ii, 2. ed.: Barnabae epist., Papiae quae supersunt etc. adiec. *O. de Gebhardt* et *Ad. Harnack*, 1878. Fasc. II: Ignatii et Polycarpi epistulae, martyria, fragmenta rec. et ill. *Th. Zahn*, 1876. Fasc. iii. Hermae Pastor graece, addita versione latina recentiore e cod. Palatino, rec. et ill. *O. de Gebhardt* et *Ad. Harnack*, 1877 (Patrum apostol. opp. rec. *O. de Gebhardt*, *Ad. Harnack* et *Th. Zahn*, ed. minor, Lipsiae, 1877. 1894, 1900, 1902). — Novum Testamentum extra canonem receptum (I. Clemens R., II. Barnabas, III. Hermas. IV Evangeliorum sec. Hebraeos, sec. Petrum, sec. Aegyptios, Matthiae traditionum, Petri et Pauli praedicationis et actuum, Petri Apocalypseos etc. quae supersunt), ed. *Ad. Hilgenfeld*, Lipsiae, 1866, 2. ed. 1876—1884. — S. Clement of Rome. The two Epistles to the Corinthians. A revised text with introduction and notes. By *J. B. Lightfoot*, Cambridge, 1869. S. Clement of Rome. An Appendix containing the newly recovered portions. With introductions, notes and translations. By *J. B. Lightfoot*, London, 1877. The Apostolic Fathers. Part ii: St. Ignatius, St. Polycarp. Revised texts with introductions, notes, dissertations and translations. By *J. B. Lightfoot*, London, 1885, 3 voll., 2. ed. 1889. The Apostolic Fathers. Part. i. St. Clement of Rome. A revised text with introductions, notes, dissertations and translations By the late *J. B. Lightfoot*, London, 1890, 2 voll. (The

Apostolic Fathers, text and translation, by *Lightfoot* and *Harmer,* 1 vol., London, 1890.)

German translations of the Apostolic Fathers were made by *Fr. X. Karker,* Breslau, 1847; *H. Scholz,* Gütersloh, 1865; *J. Chr. Mayer,* Kempten, 1869, with supplement containing the newly discovered fragments of the so-called Two Epistles to the Corinthians, Kempten 1880 (Bibliothek der Kirchenväter). The Apostolic Fathers were translated into English by *J. Donaldson* (The Ante-Nicene Christian Library, vol. i, Edinburgh, 1866); *Ch. H. Hoole,* London, 1872; Dr. *Burton,* ib. 1888—1889.

Among the writers on the Apostolic Fathers are. *Ad. Hilgenfeld,* Die Apostolischen Väter, Untersuchungen über Inhalt und Ursprung der unter ihrem Namen erhaltenen Schriften, Halle 1853. *Ch. E. Freppel,* Les Pères apostoliques et leur époque, Paris 1859. 4. éd. 1885. *J. Donaldson,* A Critical History of Christian Literature and Doctrine from the death of the Apostles to the Nicene Council. Vol. i: The Apostolical Fathers, London, 1864, 2. ed. 1874. *C. Skworzow,* Patrologische Untersuchungen. Über Ursprung der problematischen Schriften der Apostolischen Väter, Leipzig, 1875. *J. Sprinzl,* Die Theologie der Apostolischen Väter, Wien, 1880.

### § 5. The Apostles' Creed (Symbolum Apostolicum).

1. THE TEXT. According to an ancient tradition[1] the Apostles' Creed, i. e. the baptismal profession of faith of the Roman liturgy, is of apostolic origin, not only in contents, but textually. The subject of this tradition is not, however, the Creed in its present form, but in a much older one, whereof the text, both in Greek and Latin, can be reconstructed with almost absolute certainty. The oldest authority for the Greek text is a letter of Marcellus, bishop of Ancyra, to Pope Julius I., written in 337 or 338[2] The Latin text is first met with in the commentary on the Creed written by Rufinus of Aquileia († 410). The Latin text is certainly a translation from the Greek. The extant text of the Creed differs from these ancient texts chiefly by reason of a few not very important additions *(descendit ad inferos, sanctorum communionem, vitam aeternam).* The circumstances under which the present text came into use are shrouded in obscurity; it is first met with in Southern Gaul about the middle of the fifth century.

2. ITS ANTIQUITY. Caspari has demonstrated, by profound and extensive researches, that the ancient baptismal creed of the Roman Church is the common basis and root of all the primitive baptismal creeds of the West. Following in his footsteps, Kattenbusch holds that the Roman creed was also the archetype of all Eastern creeds or symbols of faith. Tertullian expressly asserts that the African Church received its baptismal creed from Rome[3]. He outlines frequently what he calls a Rule of Faith[4], i. e. a sketch of the

[1] Tradunt maiores nostri, *Rufinus,* Comm. in Symb. apost., c. 2.

[2] *Epiph.,* Haeres. 72, 2—3. [3] De praescr. haeret., c. 36.

[4] *Regula fidei, lex fidei, regula.* Cf. De praescr. haeret., c. 13; De virgin. vel. c. 1; Adv. Prax., c. 2.

universally taught ecclesiastical belief; it is simply a paraphrase of the Old-Roman baptismal creed. It was a baptismal creed that served Irenæus as a criterion in his description of «the faith, that the Church scattered through the whole world had received from the Apostles and their disciples»[1]. If the creed he describes be not that of the Roman Church, it is surely one that resembled it very much. The writings of St. Justin show that in the first half of the second century the Roman Church possessed a fixed and definite baptismal creed[2]. We possess no historical authorities older than those mentioned.

3. APOSTOLIC ORIGIN OF THE CREED. It is certain that the contents of the Old-Roman Creed are apostolic, i. e. it reproduces in an exact and reliable way the teaching of the Apostles. From what has been said in the preceding paragraph it will be seen that it is not possible to demonstrate the traditional belief in the apostolic origin of its phraseology; on the other hand it is still more difficult to overthrow the same. All objections to the contrary repose on untenable historico-dogmatic hypotheses. It is certain, on the one hand, that from the earliest days of the Church the need of some kind of a profession of Christian faith before the reception of baptism was felt; the convert must in some way express his faith in the fundamental facts and doctrines of Christianity[3]. On the other hand, it must be admitted, with Caspari, that the ancient Roman Creed «with its primitive severity, its extreme simplicity and brevity, its highly lapidary style, impresses us as a document that has come down, word for word, from the most remote Christian antiquity».

4. LITERATURE. The traditional forms or recensions of the Apostles' Creed are collected in

*H. Denzinger,* Enchiridion symbolorum et definitionum, 9. ed., aucta et emendata ab *J. Stahl,* Freiburg, 1900, pp. 1—8; with greater fulness in *A. Hahn,* Bibliothek der Symbole und Glaubensregeln der alten Kirche, 3. ed. by *G. L. Hahn,* Breslau, 1897, pp. 22 f. All modern investigations of the ancient baptismal creed of the Church date from the fundamental labours of Caspari († 1892): *C. P. Caspari,* Ungedruckte, unbeachtete und wenig beachtete Quellen zur Geschichte des Taufsymbols und der Glaubensregel, Christiania, 1866—1875, 3 vols. *Id.,* Alte und neue Quellen zur Geschichte des Taufsymbols und der Glaubensregel, ib. 1879.

Kattenbusch availed himself of the scholarly work of Caspari: *F. Kattenbusch,* Das Apostolische Symbol, seine Entstehung, sein geschichtlicher Sinn, seine ursprüngliche Stellung im Kultus und in der Theologie der Kirche. Vol. i. Die Grundgestalt des Taufsymbols, Leipzig, 1894. Vol. ii. Verbreitung und Bedeutung des Taufsymbols, 1897—1900. Cf. also *M. Nicolas,* Le symbole des Apôtres. Essai histor. Paris, 1867. *C. A. Heurtley,* A History of the Earlier Formularies of Faith of the Western and Eastern Churches, London, 1892. We can cite but a few of the writings called forth in Germany since 1892 by the «Kampf um das Apostolikum», a conflict that centred rather about the contents than about the text of the Creed.

[1] Adv. haer., i. 10, 11; cf. iii. 4, 1—2; iv. 33, 7.
[2] Apol., i. 61. [3] Acts viii. 37; cf. Mk. xvi. 16.

The chief opponent of the «Apostolikum» was *A. Harnack*, Das Apostolische Glaubensbekenntnis, Berlin, 1892, 25. ed. 1894. Among its Protestant defenders *Th. Zahn*, Das Apostolische Symbolum, Erlangen, 1893, 2. ed., was easily prominent. Catholic scholarship was represented by *S. Bäumer*, Das Apostolische Glaubensbekenntnis, Mainz, 1893, and *C. Blume*, Das Apostolische Glaubensbekenntnis, Freiburg, 1893. Cf. *B. Dörholt*, Das Taufsymbolum der alten Kirche nach Ursprung und Entwicklung. Part i: Geschichte der Symbolforschung, Paderborn, 1898. Cf. also *J. Kunze*, Glaubensregel, Heilige Schrift und Taufbekenntnis, Leipzig, 1899. Other writers on the Apostles' Creed are *O. Scheel* in Götting. Gelehrten Anzeigen, 1901, clxii. 835—864, 913—948; *A. A. Hopkins*, The Apostles' Creed, a Discussion, New York, 1900. We may also note the discussion between Dom *Fr Chamand* and *A. Vacandard* in the Revue des questions historiques, for 1901. *W Sanday*, Further Research on the History of the Creed, in Journal of Theol. Studies (1901), iii. 1—21. *G. Semeria*, Il Credo in Studi Religiosi 1902, ii. 1—21, and in Dogma, Gerarchia e Culto nella Chiesa primitiva, Rome, 1902, 315—336; *G. Voisin*, L'origine du Symbole des Apôtres, in Revue d'hist. ecclés., 1902, iii. 297—323; *A. C. Mc Giffert*, The Apostles' Creed, its Origin, its Purpose and its Historical Interpretation, London, 1902; *W W Bishop*, The Eastern Creeds and the Old Roman Symbol in American Journal of Theology, 1902, 518—528; *A. G. Mortimer*, The Creeds, an Historical and Doctrinal Exposition of the Apostles', Nicene, and Athanasian Creeds, London, 1902; *A. Cusham*, The Apostles' Creed, its Origin, its Purpose, and its Historical Interpretation, Edinburg, 1903; *V. Ermoni*, Histoire du Credo, le Symbole des Apôtres, Paris, 1903; *D. F. Weigand*, Das Apostolische Symbol im Mittelalter, eine Skizze, Gießen, 1904. *Burn*, The Textus Receptus of the Apostles' Creed, in Journal of Theol. Studies (1902), iii. 481—500.

### § 6. The Didache or Teaching of the Twelve Apostles.

1. ITS CONTENTS. This is the title of one of the oldest documents of Christian antiquity, discovered in 1883 by Philotheos Bryennios. In the only manuscript yet known, written in 1056, the little work is called *Διδαχὴ κυρίου διὰ τῶν δώδεκα ἀποστόλων τοῖς ἔθνεσιν*, while in the table of contents it is simply *Διδαχὴ τῶν δώδεκα ἀποστόλων*. The former is not only an older title than the latter, but is most probably the original. By it the anonymous author meant to suggest a compendious presentation of the teaching of Jesus Christ as preached to the gentiles by the Apostles. In length it about equals the Epistle to the Galatians, and is divided into two parts. The first (cc. 1—10) contains an ecclesiastical ritual. In it are found instruction in Christian ethics (cc. 1—6), in the shape of the description of the Two Ways, the Way of Life (cc. 1—4) and the Way of Death (c. 5). This is expressly set forth as a guide for the instruction of those who seek baptism (c. 7, 1). The author then treats of baptism (c. 7), of fasting and prayer (c. 8), and of the Blessed Eucharist (cc. 9—10). These liturgical precepts are completed in the second part by instruction concerning the mutual relations of the Christian communities (the scrutiny of wandering Christian teachers, *ἀπόστολοι καὶ προφῆται*, c. 11, the reception of travelling brethren c. 13,

the support of prophets and teachers who settle in the community, c. 13), the religious life of each community, e. g. divine service on Sundays (c. 14), and the superiors of the communities, *ἐπίσκοποι καὶ διάκονοι* (c. 15, 1—2). The work closes with a warning to be vigilant, for the last day is at hand.

2. TIME AND PLACE OF COMPOSITION. It was probably composed in the last decades of the first century, most likely in Syria or Palestine. It is undoubtedly of the highest antiquity; one meets no longer in the second Christian century with such conditions as are taken for granted in its references to the rite of baptism (c. 7), of the Blessed Eucharist (cc. 9—10), the ministers of the divine mysteries (*ἐπίσκοποι καὶ διάκονοι*, c. 15, 1), and the ministers of the divine word (*ἀπόστολοι καὶ προφῆται*, c. 11, 3). The description of the Ways of Life and Death is so strikingly similar to that of the Ways of Light and Darkness in the Epistle of Barnabas (cc. 18—20), itself probably composed at the end of the first century, that one of these two authors must have copied from the other, or both must have used a common original. Apart from this latter hypothesis, Funk, Zahn, and Schaff have shown, as against Bryennios, Harnack, Volkmar and others, that in all probability it is not the Didache which is dependent on the Epistle to Barnabas, but the contrary An older model is not to be postulated. Especially, is there no good reason for subscribing to the hypothesis of Harnack, Taylor, Savi and others, that the basis of the first chapters of the Didache is a Jewish work, some ancient catechism for proselytes. On the one hand, the existence of such a work is purely hypothetical, and on the other, the first chapters of the Didache exhibit a specific Christian character by reason of the many phrases, turns of thought and reminiscences that they borrow from the New Testament. Nor is there any sufficient reason to adopt the hypothesis of a still older Christian Didache (Urdidache) that was improved and enlarged in the work before us. With some exceptions (cc. 1, 3—2, 1) the extant manuscript of the Didache represents, quite probably, its original form.

3. ITS HISTORY. In some of the churches of the East, particularly those of Egypt, Syria, and Palestine, the Didache was once highly esteemed. Clement of Alexandria cites it as «Scripture»[1], Athanasius places it among writings suitable for catechumens alongside with some books of the Old Testament[2]; Eusebius places it among the apocrypha of the New Testament, i. e. among those books that had wrongly been placed by some in the canon[3]. The so-called Apostolic Church-Ordinance, composed probably toward the end of the third century in Egypt, contains (cc. 4—14) a description of the Two Ways, or rather

[1] *ὑπὸ τῆς γραφῆς εἴρηται*: Strom., i. 20, 100.

[2] *Διδαχὴ καλουμένη τῶν ἀποστόλων*: Ep. festal, 39.

[3] *τῶν ἀποστόλων αἱ λεγόμεναι διδαχαί*: Hist. eccl., iii. 25, 4.

of the Way of Life, in which it is easy to recognize a slight paraphrase of the first four chapters of the Didache. Similarly, a more extensive overworking of the entire Didache is met with in the first part of the seventh book of the Apostolic Constitutions (cc. 1—32), a work that was very probably compiled about the beginning of the fifth century in Syria. Among the Latins the work is first met with in the pseudo-Cyprianic homily «Adversus aleatores»[1]. There is still extant an ancient Latin version of the first six chapters.

The editio princeps of the Didache is entitled: Διδαχὴ τῶν δώδεκα ἀποστόλων, ἐκ τοῦ ἱεροσολυμιτικοῦ χειρογράφου νῦν πρῶτον ἐκδιδομένη μετὰ προλεγομένων καὶ σημειώσεων ὑπὸ Φιλοθέου Βρυεννίου μητροπολίτου Νικομηδείας. Ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει, 1883 (cxlix. 75 pp.). The «Codex Hierosolymitanus» is a parchment manuscript, written in 1056, probably in Palestine. In 1883 it was in the library of the Hospice of the Holy Sepulchre Church at Constantinople, whence it was soon transferred to the library of the Greek Patriarchate at Jerusalem. Those pages of the manuscript that contained the Didache were photographed by *J. Rendel Harris* for his edition of the text: The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles, Baltimore and London, 1887. A lively interest was at once aroused, especially in England and America, with the result that a rich and varied literature has grown up about this work. Cf. *F. X. Funk*, Doctrina duodecim apostolorum, Tübingen, 1887, pp. xlvi—lii, for the literature previous to that year[2]; a lengthier list is found in *Ph. Schaff*, The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles, 3. ed., New York, 1889, pp. 140—158, 297—320. Among the many editions of the Didache those of *Bryennios*, *Schaff*, *Funk*, and *Rendel Harris* are especially meritorious by reason of their wealth of information. See *A. Harnack*, Die Lehre der zwölf Apostel (Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur ii. 1—2), Leipzig, 1884, stereotyped 1893. All these editions contain, beside the text of the Didache, older adaptations of the Doctrine of the Two Ways, especially the Apostolic Church-Ordinance (entire or in part) and the first part of the seventh book of the Apostolic Constitutions. An Arabic adaptation of the first six chapters of the Didache, taken from a Coptic source, was discovered and published by *L. E. Iselin* and *A. Heusler*, Eine bisher unbekannte Version des ersten Teiles der Apostellehre (Texte und Untersuchungen xiii. 1), Leipzig, 1895. Harnack followed up his larger edition with a smaller one, in which he undertook to reproduce the supposed Jewish prototype of the Didache. Die Apostellehre und die jüdischen beiden Wege, Leipzig, 1886, 2. ed. 1896. Contemporaneously with his edition of the Didache, Funk brought out a new edition of the first volume of his «Opera Patrum apostolicorum» and included in it the newly-found text «Didache, seu Doctrina xii Apostolorum». In a Munich manuscript of the eleventh century *J. Schlecht* found an old Latin version of the first six chapters of the Didache; a short fragment of the same (Did. 1, 1—3; 2, 2—6) had already been edited by B. Pez in 1723 from a Melk codex of the ninth or tenth century. *Schlecht*, Die Lehre der zwölf Apostel in der Liturgie der katholischen Kirche, Freiburg, 1900; *Id.*, Doctrina XII apostolorum, Freiburg, 1900. The literature of the subject is very copious; it may suffice to indicate several essays of Funk, written 1884—1897 on the date of the origin of the Didache and on its relations to similar texts; they may be found

[1] In doctrinis apostolorum, c. 4.

[2] This list has been brought up to date in his new edition, Tübingen, 1901.

in his Kirchengeschichtliche Abhandlungen, Paderborn, 1899, ii. 108—141; cf. *Th. Zahn,* Forschungen zur Geschichte des neutestamentl. Kanons und der altkirchl. Literatur, Erlangen and Leipzig, 1884, iii. 278—319. *A. Krawutzcky,* Über die sogen. Zwölfapostellehre, ihre hauptsächlichsten Quellen und ihre erste Aufnahme, in Theol. Quartalschrift (1884), lxvi. 547—606. *K. München,* Die Lehre der zwölf Apostel, eine Schrift des 1. Jahrhunderts, in Zeitschrift für kath. Theologie (1886), x. 629—676. *C. Taylor,* The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles, with Illustrations from the Talmud, Cambridge, 1886. *Id.,* An Essay on the Theology of the Didache, ib. 1889. *G. Wohlenberg,* Die Lehre der zwölf Apostel in ihrem Verhältnis zum neutestamentlichen Schrifttum, Erlangen, 1888. *J. M. Minasi,* La dottrina del Signore pei Dodici Apostoli bandita alle genti (translation, notes and commentary), Rome, 1891. *P. Savi,* La «Dottrina degli Apostoli», ricerche critiche sull' origine del testo con una nota intorno al' eucaristia, Roma, 1893, reprinted in «Litteratura cristiana antica». *C. H. Hoole,* The Didache, London, 1894. Studi critici del P. Paolo Savi barnabita raccolti e riordinati dal can. Fr. Bolese, Siena, 1899, 47—119. Osservazioni sulla Didache degli Apostoli in Bessarione vol. ii (1897—1898), 12—17 vol. iii. *U Benigni,* Didache coptica «duarum viarum» recensio coptica monastica per arabicam versionem superstes, ib. vol. iii (1898 and 1899); iv. 311—329 (also in separate reprint). *E. Hennecke,* Die Grundschrift der Didache und ihre Rezensionen, in Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft (1901), ii. 58—72. *F. X. Funk,* Zur Didache, die Frage nach der Grundschrift und ihren Rezensionen, in Theol. Quartalschr. (1902), lxxxiv, 73—88; cf. *R. Mariano,* La dottrina dei Dodici Apostoli e la critica storica in «Il Cristianesimo nei primi secoli» (Scritti vari, iv), Florence, 1902, 357—394. *Ludwig,* Zur Lehre vom Kirchenamte in der Didache, in Hist.-polit. Blätter (1901), cxxviii. 732—739. *P. Ladeuze,* L'Eucharistie et les repas communs des fidèles dans la Didache, in Revue de l'Orient chrétien (1902), vii. 341—359. *W. Scherer,* Der Weinstock Davids (Did. 9, 2) im Lichte der Schrifterklärung betrachtet, in Katholik (1903), i. 357—365. *B. Labanca,* La dottrina degli Apostoli studiata in Italia, Roma, 1895, in Rivista italiana di filosofia x, 1895. *Th. Schermann,* Eine Elfapostelmoral oder die X-Rezension der beiden Wege, Munich, 1902 (Veröffentlichungen aus dem kirchenhistor. Seminar ii. 2). *P. Batiffol,* L'Eucharistie dans la Didache, in Revue biblique (1905), pp. 58—67. *Bigg,* Notes on the Didache, in Journal of Theol. Studies (July 1904), v. 579—589. *J. V Bartlet,* (art.) «Didache» in Hastings' Dict. of the Bible (extra vol.) (1904), pp. 438—451.

### § 7. The so-called Epistle of Barnabas.

1. ITS CONTENTS. The Letter current under the name of St. Barnabas gives the names neither of the author nor of the recipients; they are called «sons and daughters» (c. 1, 1) or «brothers» (cc. 2, 10; 3, 6, and *passim*) or «children» (cc. 7, 1; 9, 7). Though the author of the Letter had preached the Gospel among those to whom it is addressed, he nowhere indicates their dwelling-place. Apart from the exordium (c. 1) and the conclusion (c. 21) the Letter is divided into two parts of very unequal length (cc. 2—17 and 18—20). The first part of the Letter undertakes to appreciate properly the value and the meaning of the Old Testament. The author is not satisfied with the teaching of the New Testament, that the Old has been an-

nulled and the Mosaic Law abrogated. He goes farther and asserts that the Old Testament was never valid, that Judaism with its precepts and ceremonies was not ordained of God, but was a work of human folly and diabolical deceit. Deceived by the devil, the Jews had understood the Law in the literal sense, whereas they should have interpreted it, not according to the letter but according to the spirit. God asked not for external sacrifices, but for a contrite heart (c. 2); not for corporal fasting, but for good works (c. 3); not for circumcision of the flesh, but for that of the ears and the heart (c. 9); not for abstinence from the flesh of certain animals, but from the sins that are represented by these animals (c. 10). In truth, the Old Testament in its entirety was a mysterious foretelling of the New Testament; throughout its pages are everywhere suggested or prefigured the truths of Christian revelation or facts of the Gospel history. Thus, in the circumcision of the three hundred and eighteen servants of Abraham (Gen. xvii. 27; cf. xiv. 14) there is a mystical allusion to the death of our Lord on the cross: 18 = ιη = Jesus, and 300 = τ = the Cross (c. 9). In the eighteenth chapter the author passes to «another knowledge and doctrine». He describes minutely two opposite Ways, the Way of Light (c. 19) and the Way of Darkness (c. 20). It is highly probable, as has been already observed (§ 6. 2), that the introduction to the Didache was here his source and model. There can be no doubt of the unity and homogeneity of the Letter in the form in which it has come down to us: the hypotheses of retouches and interpolations, suggested by Heydecke and Weiss, are without foundation. The author's literary incapacity is evident, a fact that explains the absence of connected and consecutive thought.

2. ITS NON-AUTHENTICITY. With one voice Christian antiquity indicated as author of this work St. Barnabas, the travelling companion and fellow-labourer of the Apostle Paul, he is himself called an Apostle (Acts xiv. 4, 14; 1 Cor. ix. 5 f; cf. Gal. ii. 9). The oldest writer in whom are found express citations from the Letter is Clement of Alexandria; he frequently attributes the authorship of it to St. Barnabas[1]. This was also the belief of Origen[2]. The latter even calls it a *καθολικὴ ἐπιστολή*, probably because even then it bore no special address. Both of these Alexandrine doctors held the Letter in very great veneration. Eusebius places it[3] among the non-canonical writings, the *νόθα* or *ἀντιλεγόμεναι γραφαί*; St. Jerome among the apocryphal writings[4]. Both, however, seem firmly persuaded of the authorship of St. Barnabas. In general, throughout the patristic literature there is no expression to the contrary. But modern opinion judges differently. There may be yet an occasional defender of the authorship

[1] Strom., ii. 6, 31; 7, 35. [2] Contra Celsum, i. 63.
[3] Hist. eccl., iii. 25, 4; vi. 13, 6.
[4] De viris illustr., c. 6; Comm. in Ezech. ad 43, 19.

of St. Barnabas, but the great majority of scholars have declared the Letter non-authentic. A very decisive argument is its teaching concerning the Old Testament; it is quite opposed to the teaching of the Apostles, especially of St. Paul, and cannot therefore be attributed to St. Barnabas. Moreover, the indications of the author concerning the epoch in which he lived do not permit us to believe in the authenticity of this Letter. It is sufficiently certain that Barnabas did not survive the destruction of Jerusalem (70), a date that for the author of the Letter is already in the past (c. 16). It is also an undoubted fact that St. Barnabas was no longer alive in the time of the Emperor Nerva, when, according to the most approved conjectures, the Letter was composed.

3. TIME AND PLACE OF COMPOSITION. Two passages in the Letter are relied on to determine with some precision the date of its composition. In one (c. 4) the author maintains the proximity of the end of the world. This will come about in the time of an eleventh king who, according to the prophecy of Daniel (VII. 8, 24) has humiliated three of the ten kings who preceded him, and that, adds the author of the Letter, at the same time (*ὑφ' ἕν* c. 4. 4, 5). It seems certain that the time of the reign of this eleventh king was the period in which the Letter was composed. But who is this eleventh king? According to the most plausible opinion (Hilgenfeld, Funk) it is the Emperor Nerva (96—98). His three predecessors belong to the same family, and in and with Domitian (the last representative of the family of the Flavii) all three in a certain sense may be said to have been dethroned. It is true that, counting in Augustus, Nerva is not the eleventh but the twelfth emperor; we may admit, however, that the author has forgotten in his enumeration one of the three ephemeral emperors (Galba, Otto, or Vitellius), predecessors of Vespasian, and who were not all recognized in every part of the empire. The second passage concerning the Temple (c. 16) cannot be relied on for chronological purposes. The words «now the Temple is being rebuilt» (c. 16. 4) have been recently interpreted by Harnack of the building of the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus under Hadrian (about 130) and on the site of the Temple of Jerusalem. It is highly probable, however, from the context, that the author is speaking not of a pagan temple of stone, but of a spiritual temple in the hearts of the faithful (*πνευματικὸς ναὸς οἰκοδομούμενος τῷ κυρίῳ*, c. 16. 10). The place of composition is usually understood to be Alexandria; the allegorical interpretation of the Scriptures to which the author is very much addicted was a special characteristic of that city. The Letter's immediate circle of readers might well be a mixed community of Judaeo-Christians and Gentile converts in the vicinity of Alexandria.

4. MANUSCRIPTS AND EDITIONS. The «Letter of Barnabas» is found complete in two manuscripts. The older and more important is the Greek biblical

codex of the fourth century, discovered in 1859, by *C. Tischendorf,* and known as the *Codex Sinaiticus.* It contains, as an appendix to the biblical books, the Letter of Barnabas and a part of the Shepherd of Hermas. The other manuscript is the *Codex Hierosolymitanus* of the year 1056, discovered by *Ph. Bryennios* (fol. 33r—51v). There are also several manuscripts of this Letter that come down from a single archetype, but in which are lacking the first four chapters and half of the fifth. their text begins (c. 5. 7) with the words τὸν λαὸν τὸν καινόν. An additional means of controlling the text of the Letter is found in an old Latin version, very faulty however and incomplete, preserved in a St. Petersburg codex of the ninth or tenth century; it contains the text of cc. 1—17 The Letter was first printed, together with the Letters of St. Ignatius, by J. Ussher, the Anglican archbishop of Armagh, in 1642. Cf. *J. H. Backhouse,* The Editio Princeps of the Epistle of Barnabas by Archbishop Ussher, Oxford, 1883. A second and separate edition was published by the Maurist Benedictine *Hugo Ménard,* or rather, since his death in 1644 prevented his issue of the work, by his confrère *J. L. d'Achéry,* Paris, 1645. A third edition that included the Ignatian Letters and was based on a wider collation of manuscripts, was prepared by the Leyden philologian *J. Voss,* Amsterdam, 1646, 2. ed. London, 1680. Many of the later editions are indicated (§ 4) among the editions of the Apostolic Fathers: *J. B. Cotelier,* Paris, 1672; Antwerp, 1698; Amsterdam 1724 (reprinted in *Gallandi,* Bibl. vet. Patr. t. i; *Migne,* PG. ii.); *C. J. Hefele* Tübingen 1839, 4. ed. 1855; *A. M. Dressel,* Leipzig, 1857, 2. ed. 1863; *A. Hilgenfeld,* ib. 1866, 2. ed. 1877. *O. von Gebhardt* and *A. Harnack,* ib. 1875, 2. ed. 1878; *Fr. X. Funk,* Tübingen, 1878, 1887, 1901. — Translations of and works on the Apostolic Fathers are mentioned in § 4. Among the special studies on the Letter of Barnabas cf. *C. J. Hefele,* Das Sendschreiben des Apostels Barnabas, aufs neue untersucht, übersetzt und erklärt, Tübingen, 1840. *J. Kayser,* Über den sog. Barnabasbrief, Paderborn, 1866. *J. G. Müller,* Erklärung des Barnabasbriefes, Leipzig, 1869. *Chr. J. Riggenbach,* Der sogen. Brief des Barnabas, Übersetzung, Bemerkungen, Basel, 1873. *C. Heydecke,* Dissertatio qua Barnabae Epistola interpolata demonstratur, Brunsvigi, 1874. *O. Braunsberger,* Der Apostel Barnabas. Sein Leben und der ihm beigelegte Brief, wissenschaftlich gewürdigt, Mainz, 1876. *W. Cunningham,* The Epistle of S. Barnabas. A Dissertation including a Discussion of its date and authorship, London, 1877. Two dissertations by *Funk,* on the date of authorship of the Epistle, are reprinted in his Kirchengeschichtliche Abhandlungen und Untersuchungen (1899), ii. 77—108. *C. Fr. Arnold,* Quaestionum de compositione et fontibus Barnabae epistolae capita nonnulla (Dissert. inaug.), Regiomonti, 1886. *J. Weiß,* Der Barnabasbrief, kritisch untersucht, Berlin, 1888. *A. Harnack,* Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur (1897), ii. 410—428. *A. Ladeuze,* L'Épître de Barnabé, in Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique (1900), i. 31—40, 212—225. On the formal or artistic execution of the Epistle cf. *T M. Wehofer,* Untersuchungen zur altchristlichen Epistolographie, Vienna, 1901. *A. van Veldhuizen,* De Brief van Barnabas, Groningen, 1901. *A. Di Pauli,* Kritisches zum Barnabasbrief, in Histor.-polit. Blätter (1902), cxxxi 318—324. *J. Turmel,* La lettre de Barnabé, in Annales de philos. chrétienne, 1903, juillet, 387—398.

### § 8. Clement of Rome.

1. HIS LIFE. According to St. Irenæus[1], he was the third successor of St. Peter in the Roman See. The later opinion that Clement

[1] Adv. haer., iii. 3, 3.

was the immediate successor of St. Peter[1] is probably derived from the so-called Clementine Literature (§ 26, 3) and certainly is unhistorical. Eusebius himself looked on Clement as the fourth pope, and reckoned his pontificate at nine years (92—101), from the twelfth year of Domitian to the third of Trajan[2]. For his early life we are reduced to conjecture. The Clementine statement that he belonged to the imperial family of the Flavii deserves no credence. Recent writers have wisely abandoned the hypothesis, closely related to the Clementine view, that Clement is identical with the consul Titus Flavius Clemens, a cousin of Domitian, put to death (95 or 96) as guilty of atheism and Jewish practices, i. e. very probably as a Christian[3]. The general impression produced by his Epistle to the Corinthians seems favourable to the thesis that Clement was of Jewish, not Gentile, parentage. The relatively very late narratives of his martyrdom can hardly claim to be more than poetry and saga. Origen[4] and Eusebius[5] identify our writer with that Clement whom St. Paul names and praises as one of his «fellow-labourers»[6]

The «testimonia» of antiquity concerning Clement are discussed at length in *Lightfoot,* The Apostolic Fathers, part I, London, 1890, i. 14—103, 104—115, 201—345. For his place in the catalogue of popes see *Duchesne,* Liber Pontificalis, I, Paris, 1886, lxxi.—lxxxiii, and for the consul Titus Flavius Clemens, *Fr X. Funk,* Kirchengeschichtl. Abhandlungen und Untersuchungen, Paderborn, 1897, i. 308—329.

2. THE LETTER TO THE CORINTHIANS. Clement is the author of a long Letter to the Christian community at Corinth, that has reached us in the Greek original and in a Latin and a Syriac version. In that city a few bold and presumptuous men (c. i. 1, cf. 47. 6) had risen against their ecclesiastical superiors and driven them from their offices; Clement desires to put an end to the confusion. In the exordium of his Letter he depicts in lively colours the former flourishing state of the Church of Corinth; after a brief notice of the very deplorable actual condition of the community, he goes on to the first part of the Letter (cc. 4—36). It contains instruction and exhortation of a general character, warns the Corinthians against envy and jealousy, recommends humility and obedience, and appeals continually to the types and examples of these virtues offered by the Old Testament. The second part (cc. 36—61) deals more directly with the situation at Corinth. He treats here of the ecclesiastical hierarchy and exhibits the necessity of subjection to the legitimate ecclesiastical authorities. In conclusion (cc. 62—65) he

[1] *St. Jer.*, De viris illustr., c. 15.
[2] Hist. eccl., iii. 15, 34; cf. Chron. ad an. Abrah. 2110.
[3] *Dio Cassius,* Hist. Rom., lxvii. 14; cf. *Suet.*, Domit., c. 15.
[4] Comm. in Jo., vi. 36. [5] Hist. eccl., iii. 15.
[6] Phil. iv. 3.

summarizes what he has already said. Long ago Photius recognized[1] the simplicity and clearness of his style. The name of Clement does not appear in the Letter; it presents itself, formally, as a writing of the Christian community at Rome. There can be no doubt, however, that it is the work of Clement, who wrote as the head and representative of the Roman community[2]. Quite decisive are the words of Dionysius of Corinth in his reply to a letter of Pope Soter[3] written about 170: «To-day we have celebrated the Lord's holy day, in which we have read your Letter. From it, whenever we read it, we shall always be able to draw advice, as also from the former Letter which was written to us by Clement»: *ὡς καὶ τὴν προτέραν ἡμῖν διὰ Κλήμεντος γραφεῖσαν*, sc. *ἐπιστολήν*. Without naming him, St. Polycarp quotes Clement in his own Letter to the Philippians. The Letter of Clement was probably composed towards the end of the reign of Domitian (81—96) or the beginning of that of Nerva (96—98). From the lost work of Hegesippus, Eusebius learned that the agitation and discord at Corinth which gave occasion to the Letter, arose in the time of Domitian[4] In the history of Christian doctrine this communication to the Church of Corinth is very important as a «de facto» witness to the primacy of the Roman Church. The hypothesis that the Corinthians solicited the intervention of the Roman Church is incompatible with certain passages in the Letter (cc. i. 1; 47, 6—7). It may be added that the primitive authority of that Church shines out all the more clearly if it be accepted that it dealt unasked with the affairs of the Corinthian Church, in the conviction that the restoration of order was a duty incumben upon it.

The Letter to the Corinthians, and the so-called Second Letter to the same, have come down to us in two Greek manuscripts, the Codex Hierosolymitanus of 1056 (§ 6, 4; 7, 4) and the so-called Codex Alexandrinus, the latter being the well-known fifth-century biblical codex of the British Museum at London. In the latter manuscript the text of both Letters, particularly that of the second, has reached us in a very imperfect condition. The Codex Alexandrinus has been reproduced in photographic facsimile: Facsimile of the Codex Alexandrinus, vol. IV New Testament and Clementine Epistles, London, 1879. A similar photographic reproduction of the text of Clement as found in the Codex Hierosolymitanus (fol. $51^{v}$—$76^{r}$) may be seen in *Lightfoot,* The Apostolic Fathers, part I (1890), i. 421—474. A very old and very literal Latin version of the first Letter was edited by *G. Morin* from a codex of the eleventh century, Maredsous, 1894 (Anecdota Maredsolana, ii). Cf. *A. Harnack* in Sitzungsberichte der kgl. preuß. Akademie der Wissenschaften, Berlin, 1894, pp. 261—273, 601—621; *E. Wölfflin* in Archiv für latein. Lexikographie und Grammatik (1894), ix. 81—100; *H. Kihn* in Theol. Quartalschrift (1894), lxxvi.

[1] Bibl. cod., p. 126.
[2] *Eus.*, Hist. eccl., iii. 38, 1. *St. Jer.*, De viris illustr., c. 15.
[3] *Eus.*, ib., iv. 23, 11. [4] Ib., iii. 16; iv. 22, 1.

540—549. An ancient Syriac version of both Letters is met with in a Cambridge manuscript of 1170; the more important readings were published by *Lightfoot*, St. Clement of Rome, an Appendix, London 1877, pp. 397—470; cf. *Id.*, The Apostolic Fathers, part I (1890), i. 129—146. The complete text was published by *R. L. Bensly*, or rather after his death, by *R. H. Kennet*, London, 1899. The *editio princeps* of both Letters is that of *P. Junius* (Young), Oxford, 1633, 2. ed. 1637, whence *Cotelier* took them for his edition of the Patres aevi apostolici, Paris, 1672. Since then they are found in every edition of the Apostolic Fathers (§ 4). Philotheos Bryennios was the first to publish from the Codex Hierosol. the full text of both Letters. The most valuable edition is that of Lightfoot († 1889), in the second edition of the first part of his Apostolic Fathers published at London, 1890, after his death. The first Letter was also edited by *R. Knopf*, Leipzig, 1899 (Texte und Untersuchungen, new series, v. i.) and in the first volume of the first series of the Bibliotheca Sanctorum Patrum edited by *S. Vizzini*, Rome, 1901. German translations of both Letters have been published recently by *Karger*, *Schalz*, and *Mayer* (§ 4). Among the English translations see that of *Lightfoot*, St. Clement of Rome, An Appendix (1877), 345—390; cf. The Apostolic Fathers, i (1890), ii. 271—316. From the literature on the First Epistle to the Corinthians we quote: *R. A. Lipsius*, De Clementis Romani epistola ad Corinthios priore disquisitio, Leipzig, 1855. *A. Brüll*, Der erste Brief des Clemens von Rom an die Korinther und seine geschichtliche Bedeutung, Freiburg, 1883. *W. Wrede*, Untersuchungen zum ersten Clemensbrief, Göttingen, 1891. *L. Lemme*, Das Judenchristentum der Urkirche und der Brief des Clemens Romanus, in Neue Jahrbücher für deutsche Theol. (1892), i. 325—480. *G. Courtois*, L'Épître de Clément de Rome (Thèse), Montauban, 1894. *J. P. Bang*, Studien über Clemens Romanus, in Theol. Studien und Kritiken (1898), lxxi. 431—486. Cf. *Ad. Harnack*, in Texte und Untersuchungen, xx, new series, v. 3 (1890), 70—80. *B. Heurtier*, Le dogme de la Trinité dans l'Épître de St. Clément de Rome et le Pasteur d'Hermas (Thèse), Lyon, 1890. *A. Stahl*, Patristische Untersuchungen, i. Der erste Brief des römischen Clemens, Leipzig, 1901. *W Scherer*, Der erste Clemensbrief an die Korinther nach seiner Bedeutung für die Glaubenslehre der kathol. Kirche am Ausgang des 1. Jahrhunderts, Regensburg, 1902. For the style and diction of the Letter cf. *Wehofer* op. cit. (§ 7, 4). *E. Dorsch*, Die Gottheit Jesu bei Clemens von Rom, in Zeitschrift für kath. Theol. (1902), xxvi. 466—491. *J. Turmel*, Étude sur la Lettre de St. Clément de Rome aux Corinthiens, in Annales de philos. chrétienne (1903), Mai, 144—160. *A. van Veldhuyzen*, De tekst van z. g. eersten Brief van Clemens aan de Korinthiers, in Theol. Studien (1903), i. 1—34. *B. Schweitzer*, Glaube und Werke bei Clemens Romanus, in Theol. Quartalschrift (1903), lxxxv 417—437, 547—575.

3. THE SO-CALLED SECOND LETTER TO THE CORINTHIANS. In the manuscripts (Greek and Syriac), likewise in the printed editions, the Letter to the Corinthians is followed by another work, usually called the Second Letter to the Corinthians. The character of its contents is very general: the Christian must lead a life worthy of his vocation, must prefer the promises of the future to the joys of the present, must be conscious of the necessity of doing penance etc. It is first mentioned by *Eusebius*[1] as purporting to be the Second Letter of Clement. Since the fifth century it circulated among the Greeks and Syrians as

[1] Hist. eccl., iii. 38, 4; cf. *St. Jer.*, De viris illustr., c. 15.

the Second Letter of Clement to the Corinthians. Eusebius himself had some suspicion that it could not be the work of Clement. It is now generally admitted that internal and external criteria make it clear that the document belongs to the middle of the second century, if not to a somewhat later date. When the full text was published in 1875, it became evident that it was not a letter, but a sermon (cf. cc. 15. 2; 17. 3; 19. 1). This fact is enough to refute a former hypothesis, recently defended by Harnack, that in this writing we possess the Letter of Pope Soter (166—174) to the community of Corinth, otherwise known to us only through the fragments of the reply of Dionysius, bishop of that city[1]. It is probable, moreover, that this sermon was preached, not at Rome but at Corinth (c. 7 1—3).

For the manuscript-tradition, editions, and versions of the so-called Second Letter to the Corinthians, see above, p. 26. *H. Hagemann,* Über den zweiten Brief des Clemens von Rom, in Theol. Quartalschrift (1861), xliii. 509—531. *Ad. Harnack,* Über den sog. zweiten Brief des Clemens an die Korinther, in Zeitschr. für Kirchengesch. (1876—1877), i. 264—283, 329—364. *Id.,* Gesch. der altchristl. Literatur, ii. 1 438—450. *Funk,* Der sog. zweite Clemensbrief, in Theol. Quartalschr., lxxxiv. (1902) 345—364. *R. Knopf,* Die Anagnose zum zweiten Clemensbriefe, in Zeitschrift für die neutestamentl. Wissensch. 1902, iii. 266—279.

4. THE TWO LETTERS TO VIRGINS. Two Letters in Syriac have come down to us under the name of Clement. Both are addressed to Virgins, i. e. to unmarried persons or ascetics of both sexes; their purpose is to demonstrate the excellence of the state of virginity, and also to furnish rules of conduct whereby to avoid the perils of that condition. Cotterill discovered (1884) in the «Pandects» of the Palestinian monk Antiochus (c. 620) lengthy fragments of a Greek text of both Letters. There is every probability that the Greek text is the original from which the Syriac version was made. The earliest traces of the Letters are in Epiphanius[2] Their evident opposition to the «Subintroductae» makes it probable that they were written in the third century, perhaps in Syria or Palestine. It is clear from Epiphanius (l. c.) that in the fourth century they were held there in great esteem. As the conclusion is lacking to the first and the introduction to the second, it is very probable that originally the two Letters were one document.

The Syriac text of the two Letters was found by *J. J. Wetstein* in a Peschitto-Codex of the New Testament, of the year 1470, and edited by him at Leyden in 1752 with a Latin version. A reprint of the Syriac text of Wetstein is found in *Gallandi,* Bibl. vet. Patr., i., and in *Migne,* PG., i. *P. Zingerle* published a German translation at Vienna, 1827. The Syriac text was re-edited, with a Latin version, by *J. Th. Beelen,* Louvain, 1856. This Latin translation is found, with corrections, in *Funk,* Opp. Patr. Apostol., ii. 1—27. Cf. *J. M. Cotterill,* Modern Criticism and Clement's

[1] *Eus.,* Hist. eccl., iv. 23, 10—12; ii. 25, 8.

[2] Haer., xxx. 15; cf. *St. Jer.,* Adv. Jovin., i. 12.

Epistles to Virgins (first printed 1756) or their Greek version newly discovered in Antiochus Palaestinensis, Edinburgh, 1884. *Ad. Harnack,* Die pseudo-clementinischen Briefe De virginitate und die Entstehung des Mönchtums, in Sitzungsberichte der kgl. preuß. Akad. der Wissensch., Berlin, 1891, pp. 361—385. *D. Völter,* Die Apostolischen Väter neu untersucht. Part i.: Clemens, Hermas, Barnabas. Leyden, 1904.

### § 9. Ignatius of Antioch.

1. TRADITION OF THE SEVEN EPISTLES. — Ignatius, called also Theophorus, the second or (if we include St. Peter) the third bishop of Antioch[1], was exposed to wild beasts at Rome[2] under Trajan, i. e. between 98 and 117[3]. He was taken from Antioch to Rome in the custody of soldiers, and on the way wrote seven Letters to the Christians of Ephesus, Magnesia, Tralles, Rome, Philadelphia, Smyrna, and to Polycarp, bishop of the latter city. The collection of these Letters that lay before Eusebius[4] has been lost; but later collections of Ignatian Letters have been preserved, in which much scoria is mixed with the pure gold. The oldest of these, usually called the Long Recension, contains seven genuine and six spurious Letters, but even the genuine ones do not appear in their original form; they are all more or less enlarged and interpolated. The spurious Letters are those of a certain Maria of Cassobola to Ignatius, his reply, and Letters from him to the people of Tarsus, Philippi, Antioch, and to the deacon Hero of Antioch. This recension is extant in the original Greek, and in an ancient Latin version. It seems certain that we owe to one and the same hand the forgery of the spurious Letters, the interpolation of the genuine ones, and the union of all in the Long Recension. The forger was an Apollinarist, for he twice denies that the Redeemer possessed a human soul (Philipp. v. 2. Philad., vi. 6). According to the researches of Funk, he is very probably identical with the compiler of the Apostolic Constitutions that were put together in Syria early in the fifth century. Later on, a «Laus Heronis» was added to this collection, i. e. a panegyric of Ignatius in the form of a prayer to him made by Hero, very probably written in Greek; it has reached us only in a Latin and a Coptic (Lower Egyptian or Memphitic) text. Somewhere between this Long Recension of the Ignatian Letters and the collection known to Eusebius is a third collection that has also reached us in Greek and Latin. It contains the seven genuine Letters in their original form, and also the six spurious ones, with the exception of the Letter to the Philippians; it has been recently called by Funk, and not improperly, the Mixed Collection. In this collection the (genuine) Letter to the Romans is incorporated with the so-called

[1] *Orig.*, Hom. vi. in Luc.; *Eus.*, Hist. eccl., iii. 22.
[2] *Orig.*, ib.; *Eus.*, ib. iii. 36, 3.
[3] *Eus.*, Chron. post an. Abr. 2123.
[4] Hist. eccl., iii. 36, 4 ff.

Martyrium Colbertinum, a document that closes the collection, and pretends to be the account given by an eye-witness of the martyrdom of St. Ignatius. Closely related to this collection is another that has reached us only in Armenian; it too has the seven genuine and the six spurious letters. Its original is a Syriac text now lost. Similarly, there has been preserved in Syriac an abbreviated recension of the three genuine Letters to the Ephesians, the Romans, and to Polycarp. Finally we must mention four Letters preserved in Latin: two from Ignatius to the Apostle John, and one to the Blessed Virgin, with her reply. These four Letters may be traced back to the twelfth century; very probably they are of Western origin.

It is clear from the preceding that the authentic text of the seven genuine Letters must be gathered from the Mixed Recension; whose Greek original is represented in a single codex that is, moreover, incomplete — the Mediceo-Laurentianus of the eleventh century, preserved at Florence. The Letter to the Romans is lacking in this manuscript, but is found (as a part of the Martyrium Colbertinum) in the tenth century Codex Colbertinus (Paris). Two other codices are now known, but they present no substantial variation; cf. *Funk,* Patres Apostolici, 2. ed., tom. ii. lxxii sq. However, even the ancient Latin translation in the Mixed Recension may lay claim to the value of a Greek text. In addition, the text of the Syro-Armenian collection and that of the Long Recension merit consideration. There are several Greek codices of the latter; among which the Codex Monacensis (olim Augustanus) of the tenth or eleventh century must be regarded as the chief. *J. Voss* was the first to edit the original text of the genuine Letters, with the exception of that to the Romans, Amsterdam, 1646. *Th. Ruinart* published the text of the latter from the Martyrium Colbertinum, Paris, 1689. The text in *Migne,* PG., v. 625—728 is taken from *Hefele,* Opp. Patr. apostol. (3. ed. Tübingen, 1847). The most recent and best editions are those of *Zahn,* Ignatii et Polycarpi epistulae, martyria, fragmenta (Patr. apostol. opp. Rec. *O. de Gebhardt, Harnack, Zahn,* fasc. ii), Leipzig, 1876; *Funk,* Opp. Patr. apostol., i., Tübingen 1878, 1887, 1901; *Lightfoot,* The Apostolic Fathers, Part ii: St. Ignatius, St. Polycarp, London 1885, 1889, 2 vol. Lightfoot's edition presents most fully all ancient ecclesiastical tradition concerning the Letters. (Ignatii Antiocheni et Polycarpi Smyrnaei epistulae et martyria, edidit et adnotationibus instruxit *A. Hilgenfeld,* Berlin, 1902. Cf. also Ignatii et Polycarpi Epistulae in the Bibliotheca SS. Patrum of *Vizzini,* series I, vol. II, Roma, 1902.) See § 4 for the latest English and German versions of the genuine Letters. There is an English version in Lightfoot, ib. ii. 539—570, and in *J. H. Srawley,* London, 1900, 2 vol. *A. Hilgenfeld,* Die Ignatiusbriefe und die neueste Verteidigung ihrer Echtheit, in Zeitschr. für wissenschaftl. Theologie (1903), xlvi. 171—194. *Id.,* ib. 499—505. *T Nicklin,* Three Passages in SS. Ignatius and Polycarp, in Journal of Theological Studies (1902—1903), iv. 443. *A. N. Jannaris,* An Ill-used Passage of St. Ignatius (ad Philad. viii. 2), in Classical Review (1903), xviii. 24—35. *J. Dräseke,* Ein Testimonium Ignatianum, in Zeitschrift für wissenschaftl. Theol. (1903), xlvi, 506—512. The Greek text of the Long Recension was first edited by *V Hartung* (Frid), Dillingen, 1557. The text of *Migne,* op. cit. v. 729—941 is taken from *Cotelerius,* Patres aevi apost. t. ii. For new editions cf. *Zahn,* op. cit. pp. 174—296; *Funk,* op. cit. ii. 46—213; *Lightfoot,* op. cit. ii. 709—857.

For the author of the Long Recension, his theological tendencies, and his identity with the compiler of the Apostolic Constitutions, see *Funk,* Die Apostolischen Konstitutionen, Rottenburg, 1891, pp. 281—355. *Id.,* Kirchengeschichtliche Abhandlungen und Untersuchungen (1899), ii. 347 to 359; *C. Holzhey,* in Theol. Quartalschr. (1898), lxxx. 380—390; *A. Amelungk,* in Zeitschr. für wissenschaftl. Theol. (1899), xlii. 508—581; (to the contrary: *F. X. Funk,* Theologie und Zeit des Pseudo-Ignatius, in Theol. Quartalschr. [1901], lxxxiii. 411—426, and *Id.,* Le Pseudo-Ignace, in Revue d'hist. ecclésiast. [1900], i. 61—65). *A. Stahl,* Patristische Untersuchungen, II: Ignatius von Antiochien, Leipzig, 1901. The Latin text of «Laus Heronis» is in *Migne,* PL. v. 945—948; cf. *Zahn* p. 297; *Funk* ii. 214; *Lightfoot* ii. 893. *Lightfoot* gives the prayer in a Lower Egyptian or Memphitic version (p. 881 f.), and attempts a reconstruction of the Greek text (p. 893 f.). For the Latin version of the Long Recension see *Zahn* p. 175—296; *Funk* ii. 47—213. The Latin version of the Mixed Recension is in *Funk,* Die Echtheit der Ignatianischen Briefe aufs neue verteidigt, Tübingen, 1883, p. 151—204, and in *Lightfoot* ii. 597—652. *P. de Lagarde* published both Latin versions at Göttingen, 1882. The *Lightfoot* edition contains (ii. 659—687) the Syriac abbreviated recension of the three Letters to Polycarp, the Ephesians, and the Romans, first made known in 1845 by *W. Cureton;* it also contains some stray Syriac fragments of the genuine Letters in their original form, edited by *W. Wright.* For earlier editions and recensions of these Syriac texts see *E. Nestle,* Syrische Grammatik (Berlin, 1888), ii. 54, s. v. Ignatius Antiochenus. The Armenian version, derived from the Syriac, was first published at Constantinople in 1783. It also appeared at Leipzig in 1849, in *J. H. Petermann's* edition of the Ignatian Letters. The four Letters extant in Latin only are found in *Migne,* PL., v. 941—946; *Zahn* pp. 297—300; *Funk* pp. 214—217; *Lightfoot,* ii. 653—656. (*Ad. Harnack,* Zu Ignatius und Polycarp, in Miscellen [Texte und Untersuchungen, new series, v. 3] [Leipzig, 1900], pp. 80—86.)

2. CONTENTS OF THE LETTERS. — On his way to martyrdom Ignatius probably embarked at Seleucia for some port in Cilicia or Pamphylia, thence, as his Letters bear witness, he was taken by land through Asia Minor. At Smyrna there was a somewhat lengthy halt, and he met there the envoys from several Christian communities of Asia Minor come to express their veneration for the confessor of the faith. To the representatives of Ephesus, Magnesia, and Tralles, Ignatius gave Letters for those communities, in which, after making known his gratitude, he warned them to beware of heretics (Judaizers and Docetae, or rather, perhaps, Judaizing Docetae). He also exhorts them to be joyfully submissive to the ecclesiastical authorities. «Be ye careful to do all things in divine concord (*ἐν ὁμονοίᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ*). This, because the bishop presides in the place of God, and the priests are as the senate of the Apostles, and the deacons have confided to them the ministry of Jesus Christ» (Magn., 6. 1). «Let all reverence the deacons as Jesus Christ, and also the bishop; for he is the image of the Father, but the priests as the senate of God and the college of the Apostles. Without these (ecclesiastical superiors) one cannot speak of a church» (Trall., 3. 1). A fourth Letter was sent by Ignatius

from Smyrna to the Christians of Rome, to induce them to abandon all attempts to prevent the execution of his death-sentence. «I fear that your love will cause me a damage» (i. 2). «For I shall not have such another occasion to enter into the possession of God» (2. 1). «I am the wheat of God, and I must be ground by the teeth of wild beasts that I may become the pure bread of Christ» (4. 1). The preamble of this Letter offers many difficulties. However, when he calls the Roman community *(ἐκκλησία)* the *προκαθημένη τῆς ἀγάπης*, it is clear that these words do not signify «first in charity» or in the exercise of love, but rather «presiding over the society of love», i. e. the entire Church. The word *ἀγάπη* often signifies in Ignatius the entire community of Christians. — From Smyrna he went to Troas where he was met by a messenger of the Church of Antioch with the news that the persecution of the Christians had ceased in that city. From Troas he wrote to the Christians of Philadelphia and Smyrna, and also to Polycarp, the bishop of the latter city. In the first two Letters he expresses his thanks for the evidences of their love, recommends the sending of messengers to congratulate those of Antioch on the restoration of peace, and exhorts and warns them against the heretical ideas already mentioned. «I cried out (at Philadelphia) with a loud voice, with the voice of God: hold fast to the bishop, to the presbytery, to the deacons» (Philad., 7 1). «Wherever the bishop is, there let the people be, as wherever Jesus Christ is, there is the Catholic Church» (Smyrn., 8. 2; it is here that we first meet with the words «Catholic Church» in the sense of the entire body of the faithful). Ignatius meant to request the other communities of Asia Minor to express, by messenger or letter, their sympathies with the Christians of Antioch, but was prevented by an unexpected and hasty departure from Troas, he therefore asks Polycarp to appeal in his name to those communities of Asia. From Troas he went to Neapolis, crossing on his way Macedonia and Illyria. It was probably at Dyrrhachium (Durazzo), or at Apollonia, that he began his sea-voyage. From Brindisi he travelled afoot to Rome, where according to the unanimous evidence of antiquity he reached the goal of his desire. His literary remains are the outpouring of a pastoral heart, aflame with a consuming love for Jesus Christ and His Church. The style is original and extremely vivacious, the expression sonorous and often incorrect, while the strong emotions of the writer interfere frequently with the ordinary forms of expression. Very frequently he reminds us of certain epistles of the Apostle of the Gentiles.

*Th. Dreher,* S. Ignatii episc. Antioch. de Christo Deo doctrina (Progr.), Sigmaringen, 1877. *J. Nirschl,* Die Theologie des hl. Ignatius, Mainz, 1880. *J. H. Newman,* The Theology of St. Ignatius, in Hist. Sketches I (London, 1890), v. 222—262. *E.* Freiherr *v. d. Goltz,* Ignatius von Antiochien als Christ und Theologe, Leipzig, 1894 (Texte und Untersuchungen,

xii. 3). *E. Bruston,* Ignace d'Antioche, ses épîtres, sa théologie, Paris, 1897. The term προκαθημένη τῆς ἀγάπης, in the inscription of the Letter to the Romans, is discussed by *Ad. Harnack,* in Sitzungsberichte der kgl. preuß. Akad. der Wissensch. (Berlin, 1896), 111—131; *J. Chapman,* in Revue Bénédictine (1896), xiii. 385—400; *Funk,* Kirchengeschichtliche Abhandlungen und Untersuchungen (Paderborn, 1897), i. 1—23. (Cf. also the superficial and antiquated sketch of *R. Mariano,* Il Primato del Pontefice romano istituzione divina? and L'Epistola ai Romani d'Ignazio d'Antiochia, in his Il Cristianesimo nei primi tre secoli [Scritti vari, iv—v.], Firence, 1902, pp. 390—403.)

3. AUTHENTICITY. — For centuries the authenticity of the Ignatian Letters has been disputed. The successive discovery and publication of the collections and recensions described above caused the question to pass through many phases, while the incomparable value of the evidence that the Letters, if authentic, give concerning the constitution and organization of the primitive Christian communities continually fed the flame of discussion. Although it cannot be said that there is at present an absolute harmony of opinion, the end of the controversy is at hand, since even the principal non-Catholic scholars, Zahn, Lightfoot, Harnack, unreservedly maintain that the Letters are authentic. The evidence for their authenticity is simply overwhelming. Irenæus himself refers to a passage of the Letter to the Romans (c. 4. 1) in the following words[1]: «Quemadmodum quidam de nostris dixit propter martyrium in Deum adiudicatus ad bestias». The romance of Lucian of Samosata, *De morte Peregrini,* written in 167, agrees to such an extent with the Letters of Ignatius, both as to facts and phraseology, that the coincidence seems inexplicable except on the hypothesis that Lucian made a tacit use of these Letters. A significant phrase in the Letter of the Church of Smyrna, apropos of the death of Polycarp (c. 3), has always recalled an expression in the Letter to the Romans (c. 5. 2). Polycarp himself says in his Letter to the Philippians: «The Letters of Ignatius that he sent to us, and such others as we had in hand, we have sent to you, according to your wish. They are added to this Letter. You will find them very useful; for they contain faith and patience and much edification relative to Our Lord.» These words, written shortly after the death of Ignatius, are so final and decisive that the opponents of the authenticity of the Ignatian Letters are obliged to reject the Letter of Polycarp as a forgery, or at least to maintain that the passages concerning Ignatius are interpolated. They have sought to counterbalance external evidence by objections drawn from the Letters themselves. They argue that the portrait of the bishop of Antioch as presented in these Letters, has been disfigured by the addition of impossible features; that heresy was neither so important a matter nor so fully developed in the time of Ignatius; above all,

[1] Adv. haer., v. 28, 4.

that the ecclesiastical constitution exhibited in the Letters has attained a maturity which is really met with only in a later period. It is true that in these Letters the bishop is exhibited, in language of almost surprising precision, as distinct from the presbyters; that the monarchical, and not the collegiate or presbyteral, constitution of the Church is set forth as an accomplished fact. But if Irenaeus could compile a catalogue of the bishops of Rome that goes back to the Apostles[1], it becomes impossible to maintain that the episcopate began only with the second century Nor can it be said that the Letters were forged in the interest of episcopal power; the episcopate is set forth in them as something well-established and accepted, of whose legitimacy no one doubts. Still less can an argument be drawn from the history of heresy; the heretic Cerinthus flourished in the life-time of the Apostle John. All search for the traces of a polemic in these Letters against the Gnosis of Valentinian has proved fruitless. Finally, the pretended lack of naturalness in the person of Ignatius would become a positive mystery if such a figure had been created by a forger.

Not long after the discovery of the Mixed Recension the Anglican *J. Pearson* successfully vindicated the authenticity of the Seven Letters. (Vindiciae epistolarum S. Ignatii, Cambridge, 1672, Oxford, 1852; *Migne,* PG., v. 37—473) against the Reformer *J. Dallaeus* (De scriptis quae sub Dionysii Areop. et Ignatii Antioch. nominibus circumferuntur, Genevæ, 1666). After editing (1845) the Syriac text of the three abbreviated Letters to the Ephesians, Romans, and Polycarp, *W Cureton* published a quite untenable apology for them as the genuine Letters of Ignatius. He maintained that the longer form of the same in the Mixed Recension was the work of an interpolator, and the remaining four simply forgeries (Vindiciae Ignatianae, London, 1846). For the more recent literature cf. *J. Nirschl,* Das Todesjahr des hl. Ignatius von Antiochien und die drei orientalischen Feldzüge des Kaisers Trajan, Passau, 1869. *Th. Zahn,* Ignatius von Antiochien, Gotha, 1873. In his Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur, ii. 1, 381—406, *Ad. Harnack* abandoned, as antiquated, the hypothesis of his earlier work. Die Zeit des Ignatius (Leipzig, 1878), in which he had attempted to place the death of Ignatius about 138. *F X. Funk,* Die Echtheit der Ignatianischen Briefe aufs neue verteidigt, Tübingen, 1883. *W D. Killen,* The Ignatian Epistles entirely spurious, Edinburgh, 1866. *R. C. Jenkins,* Ignatian Difficulties and Historic Doubts, London, 1890. *D. Völter,* Die Ignatianischen Briefe, auf ihren Ursprung untersucht, Tübingen, 1892. *J. Réville,* Études sur les origines de l'épiscopat. La valeur du témoignage d'Ignace d'Antioche, Paris, 1891. *Id.,* Les origines de l'épiscopat, Part. i (Paris, 1894), 442—520. *L. Tonetti,* Il Peregrinus di Luciano e i cristiani del suo tempo, in Miscellanea di storia e coltura eccles. (1904), 72—84.

### § 10. Polycarp of Smyrna.

1. HIS LIFE. — Irenæus has preserved some precious details concerning Polycarp, the bishop of Smyrna, to whom Ignatius wrote one of his seven Letters. Irenæus had listened, as a boy, to the dis-

[1] Adv. haer., iii. 3, 3.

courses of the old bishop, and had «heard him tell of his relations with John (the Apostle) and with others who had seen the Lord, and how he quoted from their language, and how much he had learned from them concerning the Lord and His miracles and teaching»[1]. At the end of 154 or at the beginning of 155 Polycarp visited Rome, in the hope of coming to an understanding with Pope Anicetus concerning the manner of the celebration of Easter, «but neither could Anicetus move Polycarp to give up his custom, which he had always observed with the Apostle John, the disciple of Our Lord, and with the other Apostles with whom he had conversed, nor could Polycarp move Anicetus to adopt that custom, the latter declaring that he was bound to keep up the customs of his predecessors *(τῶν πρὸ αὐτοῦ πρεσβυτέρων)*. Nevertheless, they preserved communion with one another, and in order to do him honour, Anicetus caused Polycarp to celebrate the Eucharist in his church, and they parted in peace»[2]. Not long after this incident Polycarp died the death of a martyr at Smyrna in his eighty-sixth year. In an Encyclical Letter the community of Smyrna made known to all Christians his death and the circumstances of his martyrdom. From its context (c. 21; cf. 8, 1) we can ascertain with approximate certainty that Polycarp died February 23., in 155.

*Th. Zahn,* Forschungen zur Gesch. des neutestamentl. Kanons und der altkirchl. Literatur (1891), iv. 249—283; (1900), vi. 94—109. (*K. Bihlmeyer,* Der Besuch Polykarps bei Anicet und der Osterfeierstreit, in Katholik [1902], i. 314—327.) Concerning the date of Polycarp's death, cf. *Harnack,* Gesch. der altchristl. Literatur (1897), ii. 1, 334—356. *P. Corssen,* Das Todesjahr Polykarps, in Zeitschr. für neutestamentl. Wissensch. (1902), iii. 61—82. For the encyclical letter of the community of Smyrna, cf. § 59, 2.

2. LETTER TO THE PHILIPPIANS. — Irenæus speaks of Letters sent by Polycarp «partly to neighbouring communities to confirm them (in the faith), partly to individual brethren to instruct and exhort them[3].» On another occasion he writes: «There is a very excellent *(ἱκανωτάτη)* letter of Polycarp to the Philippians, from which the form of his faith and the teaching of truth can be seen by those who are of good will and intent on their salvation»[4]. Only fragments of the original Greek have reached us, but we possess the entire text in an old Latin translation. It is a word of comfort written at the request of the community of Philippi in Macedonia, and encourages all its members to constancy; it inculcates, moreover, the special duties of married people, of widows, deacons, youths, virgins, and the clergy. This Letter of Polycarp is full of imitations and reminiscencies of the Letter of St. Clement to the Corinthians (c. 9, 2; 13, 2). As late as the end

[1] *Iren.,* Ep. ad Florin., in *Eus.,* Hist. eccl. v. 20, 6.
[2] *Iren.,* Ep. ad Vict., in *Eus.,* Hist. eccl., v. 24, 16 sq.
[3] Hist. eccl., v. 20, 8. [4] Adv. haer., iii. 3, 4.

of the fourth century some communities af Asia Minor were wont to read it during divine service[1]. Some recent writers have disputed its authenticity or denied its integrity, but only with the object of crippling its value as an evidence of the authenticity of the Ignatian Letters (cf. § 9, 3). Its authenticity is guaranteed by Irenæus; nor can the distinction between a genuine nucleus and later accretions be upheld, in view of the striking unity of its style, and its constant dependence on the Letter of St. Clement.

The Greek codices of the Letter to the Philippians are all, directly or indirectly, copies of one exemplar; all end at c. 9, 2, with the words καὶ οἱ ἡμᾶς ὁπό. The rest of the Letter (cc. 10—14) is taken from an old Latin translation, itself very carelessly made. However, the Greek text of chapters 9 and 13 has been preserved in the Church History of Eusebius[2]. The Latin translation was edited by *J. Faber Stapulensis,* Paris, 1498. The Greek text (c. 1—9) was first edited by *P. Halloix,* Douai, 1633. The Greek text in *Migne* (PG., v. 1005—1016) is taken from *Hefele*. Opp. Patr. apost., Tübingen, 1847. The most important recent editions are those of *Zahn,* Leipzig, 1876; *Funk,* Tübingen, 1878, 1887, 1901; *Lightfoot,* London, 1885, 1889; (*Hilgenfeld,* Berlin, 1902; *Vizzini,* in the Bibliotheca Sanct. Patrum, series ii, vol. ii, Rome, 1901; cf. § 4; 9, 1). Zahn re-translated into Greek the part that has reached us in Latin only. His translation has been improved by Funk in some places. Lightfoot executed a new re-translation. New editions of the old Latin version (PG., v. 1015—1022) are found in *Zahn* l. c., also in *Funk,* Die Echtheit der Ignatianischen Briefe, Tübingen, 1883, pp. 205—212. Cf. *A. Harnack,* Zu Polycarp ad Philipp. ii., in Miscellen (Texte und Untersuchungen, new series, v 3), pp. 86—93. For new versions of the Letter to the Philippians see § 4. (*T Nicklin,* Three Passages in SS. Ignatius and Polycarp, in Journal of Theological Studies [1902—1903], iv. 443.) *Funk,* Die Echtheit der Ignat. Briefe, 14—42 «Der Polykarpbrief» The hypothesis of an interpolation proposed by *A. Ritschl* (Die Entstehung der altkath. Kirche, 2 ed., Bonn, 1857, 584—600), was accepted by *G. Volkmar,* in his Epist. Polyc. Smyrn. genuina, Zürich, 1885, and in Theol. Zeitschrift aus der Schweiz (1886), iii. 99—111, also by *A. Hilgenfeld,* in Zeitschrift für wissenschaftl. Theologie (1888), xxix. 180—206. J. M. Cotterill found citations from this Letter in the «Pandects» of the Palestinian monk Antiochus (c. 620) whereupon he declared Antiochus to be the author of the Letter of Polycarp; cf Journal of Philology (1891), xix. 241—285. This discovery did not merit the honour of the solid refutation from the pen of *C. Taylor,* ib. (1892), xx. 65—110. (*J. Turmel,* Lettre et martyre de Saint Polycarpe, in Annales de philosophie chrét. [1904[ 22—33.)

3. Latin Fragments. — Five small Latin fragments, current under the name of Polycarp, treat of certain Gospel texts; they are, according to all appearances, spurious.

These fragments were published by *Fr. Feuardent* in the notes to his edition of Irenæus (Cologne 1596, reprinted 1639). They were taken by him from a Latin Catena on the four Gospels. The compiler of the Catena, now lost, had found these fragments in a work of Victor, bishop of Capua († 554). Other recensions of these fragments are in *Migne* (l. c.

[1] *St. Jer.,* De viris illustr., c. 17. [2] iii. 36, 13—15.

v. 1025—1028), *Zahn* (l. c. 171—172), and *Lightfoot* (l. c. 1001—1004), *Funk*, Patres apostolici (1901), ii. 288 sq. In his Geschichte des neutestamentl. Kanons, i. 782 f., *Zahn* undertook to defend their authenticity, with the exception of one phrase.

### § 11. The Shepherd of Hermas.

1. CONTENTS. The longest, and for form and contents the most remarkable of the writings of the so-called Apostolic Fathers, is the Shepherd (*ποιμήν*, Pastor) of Hermas. It contains five Visions (*ὁράσεις*, visiones), twelve Commandments (*ἐντολαί*, mandata), and ten Similitudes (*παραβολαί*, similitudines). This triple division is only external, and does not affect the contents. Hermas himself, or the angel who speaks to him, seems in the last Vision (v, 5) to distinguish two parts: the preceding Visions (i—iv) that the Church, in the guise of a Matron, exhibits to the author, and the subsequent Mandates and Similitudes expounded to Hermas by an angel of penance in the garb of a Shepherd. The true sign of demarcation is the organ of revelation, first the Matron and then the Shepherd (Sim. ix. 1, 1—3). It is the prominence of the latter in the second part of the work that justifies its peculiar title. It is true that he also appears in the first part of the book, but in a subordinate role and not in the Shepherd's guise (cf. Vis. ii. 4, 1; iii. 10, 7). All the revelations made to Hermas end with exhortations to penance, directed first to himself and the members of his family, then to the Roman Church, and to all Christians. This call to the penitential life is justified throughout by the imminent persecutions of the Church, and the near coming of Christ in Judgment. The general outline of the work is found in the first four Visions. The Matron, representative of the Church, grows constantly younger, until she appears in the fourth Vision as a bride who comes forth in splendour from the nuptial chamber. Both the manner of the Matron's appearance, and the revelations and instructions that she gives, exhibit a steady progress of penitential exhortation. The third Vision is by far the most important. It presents the Communion of Saints, i. e. those who are baptized and remain faithful to the grace of baptism, whether yet living or already departed, under the image of a great tower rising from the water and built of square and shining blocks. Those who through sin have lost their baptismal grace, are represented by the stones that lie scattered about, and which must be trimmed and polished before finding a place in the tower. The Mandates and Similitudes to which the fifth Vision serves as an introduction are destined to realize and explain the first part (cf. Vis. v. 5; Sim. ix. 1, 1—3). The Mandates have for object faith in one God (i), simplicity (ii), truthfulness (iii), chastity both in and out of matrimony (iv), mildness and patience (v), the discernment of suggestions made by

the good and the bad angels (vi), fear of the Lord (vii), temperance (viii), confidence in God (ix), forbearance from sorrowfulness (x), avoidance of false prophets (xi), and warfare against evil desires (xii). The figurative diction of the Similitudes recalls the Visions. The first is a warning against excessive solicitude for temporal goods; the second is an exhortation to charity; the third and fourth exhibit good and evil, dwelling together for the present, to be separated at the end of time; the fifth extols the merits of fasting; the sixth the necessity of penance; the seventh explains the uses of tribulation; in the eighth and the ninth the branches of the willow tree and the stones of the tower serve as illustrations of the truth that through penance the sinner may once again come into living communion with the Church, and thereby secure a place in the glorified Church of the future. The tenth ends with these words: «Through you the building of the tower has been interrupted, if you do not make haste to do good, the tower will be finished, and you will remain without» (Sim. x. 4, 4). In diction and exposition the book is diffuse and minutely circumstantial; at the same time it is popular and picturesque. Its chief characteristic is its apocalyptic form and tone. The dogmatic interest of the work lies chiefly in its teaching concerning the possibility of forgiveness of mortal sins, notably adultery and apostasy (cf. Vis. iii; Sim. viii—ix). It is only during the period of grace announced by him that the Shepherd admits a forgiveness of sins by penance (*μετάνοιαν ἁμαρτιῶν*, Mand. iv. 3, 3); in all future time there shall be but one forgiveness of sins through baptism (*μετάνοια μία*, Mand. iv. 1, 8; 3, 6). The still open way of penance is said to be long and difficult (Sim. vi—viii). The Shepherd is the earliest witness to the «Stations» or degrees of penitential satisfaction (Sim. v, 1, 1, 2).

2. ITS ORIGIN. The author of the Shepherd frequently calls himself Hermas (Vis. 1. 1, 4; 2, 2), nor does he add to that name anything more definite. He lived in very modest circumstances at Rome where he cultivated a field in the vicinity of the city (Vis. iii. 1, 2; iv. 1, 2). It was there, on the road from Rome to Cumæ, that he received the revelations of the Matron. At the end of the second Vision, there is a statement of especial interest. Hermas is commissioned by the Matron to make known her revelations to all the elect. «Make ready», she says, «two copies, and send one to Clement, and one to Grapte. Clement will send it (the little book) to the cities that are without; Grapte will instruct the widows and the orphans; but thou wilt read it in this city to the priests who are placed over the Church» (Vis. ii. 4, 3). Grapte seems to have been a deaconess. Clement is represented as Pope; he is the head of the Roman Church, and it is his duty to conduct its communications with other churches. Hermas is certainly speaking of Cle-

ment of Rome (§ 8), and refers very probably to the Letter of Clement to the Corinthians that was highly esteemed by the primitive Christian churches. Hermas presents himself, therefore, as a contemporary of Clement. Now, the author of the Muratorian Fragment says (in Zahn's recension): «Pastorem vero nuperrime temporibus nostris in urbe Roma Hermas conscripsit, sedente (in) cathedra urbis Romae ecclesiae Pio episcopo fratre ejus, et ideo legi eum quidem oportet, se publicare vero in ecclesia populo neque inter prophetas completos numero neque inter apostolos in finem temporum potest.» However difficult and obscure these words may be, it is very clear that the author of the Fragment wishes to exclude the Shepherd from the canon of biblical writings, because he is no other than the brother of Pope Pius I (c. 140—155). Modern critics are practically unanimous in agreeing with the author of the Fragment; there is, indeed, no good reason for rejecting his evidence. It is true that the author of the Shepherd is thereby declared guilty of a deceit; he was not a contemporary of Clement, for he did not write his work before 140—155. That the Shepherd was written about the middle of the second century, though not absolutely certain, is highly probable, and certain intrinsic evidence confirms it. The special predilection of the author for the question of forgiveness of mortal sins, and his diffuse treatment of the subject, suggest that he was aware of the Montanist movement, at least in its beginnings. He is an opponent of the Gnostics (Vis. iii. 7, 1; Sim. viii. 6, 5; ix. 22, 1: *θέλοντες πάντα γινώσκειν καὶ οὐδὲν ὅλως γινώσκουσι*). The persecution of the Christians to which he several times refers as having ceased, cannot be that of Domitian (81—96); it must therefore be that of Trajan (98—117). The subsequent long period of peace, during which the zeal of many Christians grew deplorably cold (Vis. ii. 2—3), was surely the reign of Antoninus Pius (138—161). Finally, the Christianity to which Hermas addresses himself, has already grown old; laxity and secularism have set in; it is clearly necessary to renew ecclesiastical discipline, particularly as to the restoration of apostates to the communion of the Church. In these dismal traits it is impossible to recognize the Church of the first century. Some modern scholars have denied that the Shepherd is from the hand of one author. De Champagny postulates two, Hilgenfeld three; their hypotheses have found few followers. The constant similarity of style and vocabulary, of tendency and situation, bears evidence to the original unity of the work. We must not, however, look on it as composed at one sitting; rather was it put together piecemeal, and grew to its present size by the gradual juxtaposition of smaller writings (Vis. v. 5; Sim. ix. 1, 1 ff; x. 1, 1). Funk has shown that there is no foundation for Spitta's imaginary discovery of a Jewish work as the basis of the Shepherd.

3. HISTORY OF THE WORK. Irenæus introduces[1] a quotation from the Shepherd with the significant formula *εἶπεν ἡ γραφή*. Clement of Alexandria made considerable use of the work and seems to have appreciated it highly. Origen thought the author identical with the Hermas of Romans xvi. 14, and says expressly that he considers it a divinely inspired work[2]: «quae scriptura valde mihi utilis videtur et, ut puto, divinitus inspirata». Yet he was aware that it was not generally admitted as such[3], and that some treated it with contempt[4] Therefore, he adds to his quotation the qualifying phrase: «si cui tamen scriptura illa recipienda videtur». Even in the fourth century it was looked on in Egypt and in Palestine as a manual quite suited to the instruction of the catechumens[5]. Its reputation passed away quicker in Italy and Africa. In the former country the author of the Muratorian Fragment is very positive in his rejection of it (see above p. 38). About the end of the second century, it must have been widely held in the Western Church that the work had no canonical authority, and deserved only limited confidence. Only thus can we find some explanation for the attitude of *Tertullian* who held the Shepherd to be «scriptura» while he was a Catholic[6], but when he became a Montanist, could thus address Pope Callixtus: «Cederem tibi, si scriptura Pastoris, quae sola moechos amat, divino instrumento meruisset incidi, si non ab omni concilio ecclesiarum, etiam vestrarum, inter apocrypha et falsa iudicaretur.»[7] Thenceforward interest in the Shepherd dwindled away in the west, and it passed so thoroughly out of general use that St. Jerome could say that it was almost unknown among the Latins; «apud Latinos paene ignotus est»[8]

4. TEXT-TRADITION AND EDITIONS. — The first to discover a codex of the Greek text of the Shepherd was the well-known forger *C. Simonides* († 1867). The manuscript was discovered by him at Mount Athos and dates from the fourteenth or fifteenth century Three folios of this codex, and a very untrustworthy copy of the remainder, made by Simonides, belong since 1856 to the University of Leipzig. The conclusion of the work is lacking (Sim. ix. 30, 3—x. 4, 5). This manuscript, or rather its Lipsian copy, was edited by Tischendorf in Dressel's edition of the Apostolic Fathers (Leipzig, 1857, 1863) and separately ib. 1856. (Simonides had sold to the Leipzig Library, not a correct copy of the manuscript, but one interpolated by himself, with the help of an old Latin version of the Shepherd known as the Vulgata, and some quotations from the Greek Fathers. His text was published as genuine, Leipzig, 1856, by *R. Anger* and *W. Dindorf* The deceit was at once laid bare, and in the same year the Library acquired a correct copy of the manuscript.) The Codex Sinaiticus (§ 7, 4) contains the first part of the Shepherd (about one

[1] Adv. haer., iv. 20, 2. [2] Comm. in Rom., x. 31.
[3] Comm. in Matth., xiv. 21. [4] De principiis, iv. 11.
[5] *Athan.*, Ep. fest. 39 an. 365; *Eus.*, Hist. eccl., iii. 3, 6.
[6] De oratione, c. 16. [7] De pudic., c. 10; cf. c. 20.
[8] De viris illustr., c. 10.

fourth; as far as Mand. iv. 3, 6). With the aid of the Leipzig manuscript, the Codex Sinaiticus, and a more or less thorough use of such other helps as translations and citations, several editions of the Shepherd soon appeared *Hilgenfeld,* Leipzig, 1866, 2. ed. 1881; *v. Gebhardt* and *Harnack*, Leipzig, 1877; *Funk,* Tübingen, 1878, 1887, 1901; cf. § 4. *J. Dräseke* published in Zeitschr. für wissenschaftl. Theol. (1887), xxx. 172—184, the conclusion of the Shepherd, from Sim. ix. 30, 3 to the end, in a Greek text that was based on a work of Simonides: Ὀρθοδόξων Ἑλλήνων θεολογικαὶ γραφαὶ τέσσαρες, London, 1859. *Hilgenfeld* soon followed with an edition of the entire Greek text, Leipzig, 1887. Unfortunately this Greek conclusion of the Shepherd is a forgery of Simonides, as *Funk* has demonstrated in Theol. Quartalschrift (1888), lxx. 51—71. A more exact knowledge of the Athos codex can be found in Lambros and Robinson. A collation of the Athos Codex of the Shepherd of Hermas by *Spyridion P Lambros;* translated and edited by *J. A. Robinson,* Cambridge, 1888. Lambros reproduced two pages of the Codex, in Byzantinische Zeitschrift (1893), ii. 609 ff. Two small (very imperfect) fragments of the Greek text (Sim. ii. 7, 10; iv 2—5) are preserved in a papyrus-roll belonging to the Berlin Museum. For a fac-simile of the text cf. *U. Wilcken,* Tafeln zur älteren griechischen Paläographie, Leipzig, 1891, Plate iii. See also *Diels* and *Harnack,* in Sitzungsberichte der kgl. preuß. Akad. d. Wissensch., Berlin, 1891, 427—431; *A. Ehrhard,* in Theol. Quartalschr. (1892), lxxiv, 294—303. Until 1856, only one ancient Latin translation was known, published at Paris in 1513 by *J. Faber Stapulensis.* It is usually called the «Vulgata», to distinguish it from the one mentioned below. The last edition of it was published by *Hilgenfeld,* Leipzig, 1873. Its numerous codices are described by *v. Gebhardt* and *Harnack* in their edition of the Greek text (Leipzig, 1877), pp. xiv—xxii; cf. *H. Delehaye,* in the Bulletin critique (1894), pp. 14—16, concerning a new manuscript of the same. *J. van den Gheyn,* Un manuscrit de l'ancienne version latine du Pasteur d'Hermas, in Muséon, new series (1902), iii. 274—277. A second Latin translation, the so-called «Palatina», was published by *Dressel* in his edition of the Apostolic Fathers, Leipzig, 1857 (1863), from a *Codex Palatinus nunc Vaticanus,* of the fourteenth century. It was incorporated, with important corrections, in *Gebhardt* and *Harnack's* edition of the Greek text, Leipzig, 1877 As to the text of this version cf. *Funk,* in Zeitschrift für die österreich. Gymnasien (1885), xxxvi. 245—249. It is generally admitted that the Vulgata version dates from the second century, and that the Palatina was made with the aid of the Vulgata in the fifth. For a different opinion cf. *J. Haussleiter*, De versionibus Pastoris Hermae latinis (Diss. inaug.), Erlangen, 1884. An Ethiopic translation derived from the Greek, made probably in the sixth century, was published by *A. d'Abbadie*, Leipzig, 1860 (Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes, ii. 1). *G. H. Schodde,* Hêrmâ Nabi: The Ethiopic version of Pastor Hermae examined, Leipzig, 1876 (Diss. inaug.), is a superficial and unreliable work.

5. RECENT LITERATURE. — For German and English translations of the Shepherd, cf. § 4. There is an English translation by *Fr. Crombie* in Ante-Nicene Fathers (Am. ed. 1885), ii. 323—435. *E. Gaâb,* Der Hirt des Hermas. Ein Beitrag zur Patristik, Basel, 1866. *Th. Zahn,* Der Hirt des Hermas untersucht, Gotha, 1868. *G. Heyne,* Quo tempore Hermae Pastor scriptus sit (Diss. inaug.), Regiomonti, 1872. *H. M. Th. Behm,* Über den Verfasser der Schrift, welche den Titel «Hirt» führt, Rostock, 1876. *J. Nirschl,* Der Hirt des Hermas. Eine historisch-kritische Untersuchung, Passau, 1879. *A. Brüll,* Der Hirt des Hermas nach Ursprung und Inhalt untersucht, Freiburg, 1882. *R. Schenk,* Zum ethischen Lehr-

begriff des Hirten des Hermas (Programm), Aschersleben, 1886. *A. Link,* Christi Person und Werke im Hirten des Hermas (Diss. inaug.), Marburg, 1886. *Id.,* Die Einheit des Pastor Hermae, ib., 1888. *P. Baumgärtner,* Die Einheit des Hermas-Buches, Freiburg, 1889. *E. Hückstädt,* Der Lehrbegriff des Hirten. Ein Beitrag zur Dogmengeschichte des 2. Jahrh., Anklam, 1889. *C. Taylor,* The Witness of Hermas to the Four Gospels, London, 1892. *F. Spitta,* Zur Geschichte und Literatur des Urchristentums. Vol. ii. Der Brief des Jakobus: Studien zum Hirten des Hermas, Göttingen, 1896. Against Spitta cf. *Funk,* in Theol. Quartalschr. (1899), lxxxi. 321—360. *D. Völter,* Die Visionen des Hermas, die Sibylle und Clemens von Rom, Berlin, 1900. *H. A. v. Bakel,* De Compositie van den Pastor Hermae (Proefschrift), Amsterdam, 1900 (the latter two maintain with Spitta a Jewish basis of the Shepherd). *U. Benigni,* Il Pastore di Erma e l'ipercritica, in Bessarione, IV (1899—1900), vol. vi. pp. 233—248. *B. Heurtier,* Le dogme de la Trinité dans l'épître de S. Clément de Rome et le Pasteur d'Hermas, Lyon, 1900. *J. Réville,* La valeur du témoignage historique du Pasteur d'Hermas, Paris, 1900. *A. Stahl,* Patristische Untersuchungen, vol. i.—iii. Der «Hirt» des Hermas, Leipzig, 1901. *P. Batiffol,* Hermas et le problème moral au second siècle, in Revue biblique (1901), x. 337—351. *J. Leipoldt,* Der Hirt des Hermas in saidischer Übersetzung, in Berliner Sitzungsberichte (1903), pp. 261—268. *J. Benazech,* Le prophétisme chrétien, depuis les origines jusqu'au «Pasteur» d'Hermas (Thèse), Cahors, 1901. *Batiffol,* Études d'histoire et de théologie positive, Paris, 1902, pp. 45—68. *Funk,* Zum Pastor Hermä, in Theol. Quartalschr., (1903), lxxxv. 639—640. The Christology of Hermas is treated by *Funk* in his second edition (1901) of the Apostolic Fathers, i. CXXXIX—CXLIII. *V. Schweitzer,* Der Pastor Hermae und die Opera supererogatoria, in Theol. Quartalschr. (1904), lxxxvi. 539—556.

### § 12. Papias of Hierapolis.

Papias, Bishop of Hierapolis, «a hearer» of the Apostle John and friend of Polycarp of Smyrna[1], wrote, apparently about 130, «Explanations of the sayings of the Lord» *(λογίων κυριακῶν ἐξηγήσεις)* in five books[2]. Some small fragments of them have reached us through citations and narrations of later writers as Irenæus and Eusebius. Prescinding from the hypothesis (postulated by the opening words in Eusebius)[3] that these sayings were taken not only from the Gospel-text but also from oral tradition, the character of the work cannot be determined with certainty Eusebius is surely wrong when from these same words he concludes, against Irenæus, that Papias did not know the Apostles, and that the «presbyter» John, whose contemporary he declares himself to be, was another than the Apostle John. The traditions handed down by Papias concerning the origin of the first two Gospels are well-known and have given rise to much controversy[4]. Eusebius believed Papias to be a man of very limited mental powers, who accepted many things that pertained to the domain of fable *(μυθικώτερα)*, especially a millenarian reign of Christ

[1] *Iren.,* Adv. haer., v. 33, 4. [2] *Eus.,* Hist. eccl., iii. 39, 1.
[3] Ib., iii. 39, 3—4. [4] Ib., iii. 39, 15—16.

on earth beginning with the resurrection of the just, a belief that he acquired through incapacity to comprehend the figurative expressions of the apostolic writers[1].

For the latest trace of the work of Papias cf. *G. Bickell,* in Zeitschrift für kath. Theol. (1879), iii. 799—803. The fragments of Papias may be found in *M. J. Routh,* Reliquiae sacrae, 2. ed. (Oxford, 1846—1848), i. 3—44 (*Migne,* PG., v 1255—1262); *Hilgenfeld,* in Zeitschr. für wissenschaftl. Theol. (1875), xviii. 231—270; *Gebhardt* and *Harnack,* Barnabae epist. (1878), pp. 87—104; *Funk,* Opp. Patrum apostol. (1881), ii. 276—300. Cf. *Pitra,* Analecta sacra (1884), ii. 155—161; *C. de Boor,* in Texte und Untersuchungen (1888), v. 2, 165—184; *E. Preuschen,* Antilegomena (Gießen, 1901), pp. 54—63. The English translation of *Roberts* and *Donaldson* is in Ante-Nicene Fathers (Am. ed. 1885), i. 153—155. — *Zahn,* Papias von Hierapolis, in Theol. Studien und Kritiken (1866), xxxix. 649—696. *Id.,* Gesch. des neutestamentl. Kanons, i. 2, 849—903; ii. 2, 790—797. *Id.,* Forschungen zur Gesch. des neutestamentl. Kanons (1900), vi. 109—157. *H. Weiffenbach,* Das Papias-Fragment bei Eusebius (Kirchengeschichte, iii. 39, 3—4), Gießen, 1874. *Id.,* Die Papias-Fragmente über Markus und Matthäus, Berlin, 1878. *C. L. Leimbach,* Das Papias-Fragment (*Eus.,* Hist. eccl.; iii. 39, 3—4), Gotha, 1875. *A. Hilgenfeld,* Papias von Hierapolis und die neueste Evangelienforschung, in Zeitschr. für wissenschaftl. Theol. (1886), xxix. 257—291. *A. Baumstark,* Zwei syrische Papiaszitate, in Oriens Christianus 1902, pp. 352—357. *Th. Mommsen,* Papianisches, in Zeitschr. für die neutestamentl. Wissenschaft (1902), iii. 156—159. *Ad. Harnack,* Pseudo-Papianisches, ib. pp. 159—166.

## SECOND SECTION.

# THE APOLOGETIC LITERATURE OF THE SECOND CENTURY

### § 13. Preliminary Observations.

If the ecclesiastical literature of the second century wears an exclusively apologetic air, this results, quite naturally, from the circumstances of that period. «The Christians are opposed by the Jews as strangers *(ἀλλόφυλοι)*, and are persecuted by the heathens»[2] Calumnies of every kind (concubitus Oedipodei, epulae Thyesteae, Onocoetes), and the ridicule and mockery of eminent writers like Lucian and Celsus, prejudiced and irritated public opinion against the Christians. The mob was stirred to violent outbreaks of hate by the heathen priests, magicians of every kind, and Jews. The antique state, with whose framework polytheism was intimately interwoven, saw itself daily more and more impelled by the instinct of self-preservation to undertake a campaign of extermination against the Christians.

It was amid these conditions that the writings of the Apologists arose. It is true that they are also more or less positive attacks on heathenism, in so far as they employ not only defensive but offen-

[1] Ib., iii. 39, 11—13. [2] Ep. ad Diognetum, 5, 17.

sive weapons. In their exposition of the nature and contents of the Christian religion, they generally furnish only so much explanation as seems necessary to defend themselves from the calumnies and prejudices of their opponents. But since they also aim at setting forth the relations of Christianity to paganism, and appeal frequently to the germs of truth contained in the latter, they offer the first contributions to the establishment of an harmonious fusion of the teachings of reason and those of revelation; thereby they prepared the way for theology or the science of faith. Although originally addressed to a heathen society, it was in Christian circles that from the beginning the apologists sought and found the majority of their readers. Formally, they usually imitate contemporary discourses, such as were then carefully worked out according to the rules of Greek rhetoricians or sophists, whose art had entered upon a kind of renaissance of fame and glory in the century of Hadrian and the Antonines.

The writings directed against the Jews are much fewer in number. Those that have reached us are in the form of dialogues, and are less intent on the refutation of Jewish accusations against the Christians than on the confirmation of the latter in their conviction that the Law of Moses had only a temporary purpose and authority. The blossoms of the Old Law had reached their full fruitage in the New Dispensation.

Complete editions of the Greek Apologists were brought out by *F. Morellus,* Paris, 1615 (reprinted Paris, 1636; Cologne 1686); the Benedictine *Prudentius Maranus,* Paris, 1742 (reprinted Venice, 1747); *J. C. Th. de Otto,* Corpus apologetarum christianorum saec. II, 9 voll., Jenae, 1847—1872 (the first five volumes, containing the works of St. Justin Martyr, were republished 1876—1881). The text of the Apologists in *Gallandi,* Bibl. vet. Patr., i.—ii., and in *Migne,* PG., vi., is taken from the edition of Maranus. A valuable contribution to the textual criticism of these writings, from the pen of *J. H. Noltes,* is found in *Migne* (col. 1705—1816).

*Ad. Harnack,* Die Überlieferung der griechischen Apologeten des 2. Jahrhunderts in der alten Kirche und im Mittelalter, in Texte und Untersuchungen, etc. (Leipzig, 1882), i. 1—2. *O. von Gebhardt,* Zur handschriftlichen Überlieferung der griechischen Apologeten, ib. 1883, i. 3, 155 to 196. *Harnack* and *von Gebhardt* have shown that, with the exception of the writings of St. Justin, the three books of Theophilus ad Autolycum, and the «Irrisio» of Hermias, the greater part of the manuscripts of the second and third century Greek Apologists that have reached us come down, directly or indirectly, from one (no longer perfect) prototype, the Arethas-Codex of the Bibliothèque Nationale at Paris (cod. Par. gr. 451), written in the year 914, by commission of Arethas, bishop of Cæsarea. This discovery has opened up a new horizon to the textual criticism of the Apologies. In the fourth volume of the Texte und Untersuchungen (1888 1891 1893) are to be found editions of the Apology of Tatian by *E. Schwartz*, of the writings of Athenagoras by the same, and of the Apology of Aristides by *E. Hennecke.* — *J. Donaldson,* A Critical History of Christian Literature and Doctrine from the death of the Apostles to the Nicene Council, vol. ii.—iii, The Apologists, London, 1866. *H. Dem-*

*bowski,* Die Quellen der christlichen Apologetik des 2. Jahrhunderts, Part i: Die Apologie Tatians, Leipzig, 1878. *G. Schmitt,* Die Apologie der drei ersten Jahrhunderte in historisch-systematischer Darstellung, Mainz, 1890. *T. Zahn,* Die apologetischen Grundgedanken in der Literatur der drei ersten Jahrhunderte systematisch dargestellt, Würzburg, 1890. Cf. *R. Mariano,* Le apologie nei primi tre secoli della Chiesa: le cagioni e gli effetti, in Il Cristianesimo nei primi tre secoli (Scritti vari, v.), Florence, 1902, pp. 7—83. On the anti-Judaizing literature of the primitive Church, cf. *Harnack,* in Texte und Untersuchungen (1883), i. 3, 56—74; *A. C. Mc Giffert,* A Dialogue between a Christian and a Jew, New York, 1889, pp. 1—47.

### § 14. Quadratus.

The most ancient Apology known to us is that of Quadratus, a disciple of the Apostles. It was written about 124, and was presented to the Emperor Hadrian on the occasion of a persecution of the Christians[1] Quadratus is rightly identified with that disciple of the Apostles who was endowed with the gift of prophecy and was, to all appearances, a resident of Asia Minor[2]. St. Jerome errs when he identifies him[3] with Quadratus, bishop of Athens, who lived in the reign of Marcus Aurelius (161—180)[4]. The sole extant fragment of the Apology of Quadratus is a citation in Eusebius[5].

For Quadratus and his Apology cf. *Routh,* Reliquiae sacrae, 2. ed., i. 69—79; *de Otto,* Corpus apologetarum christ. (1872), ix. 333—341. See also *Th. Zahn,* Forschungen zur Gesch. des neutestamentl. Kanons, etc. (1900), vi. 41—53; *Funk,* Patres App. i. 376; *Harnack,* Gesch. der altchristl. Literatur, i. 95 f.; ii. 1, 269—271; *Bardenhewer* in Kirchenlexikon of *Wetzer* and *Welte,* 2. ed., x. 645—647

### § 15. Aristides of Athens.

Until 1878 the Apology of Aristides of Athens mentioned by Eusebius[6] was looked upon as hopelessly lost. In that year the Mechitarists of San Lazzaro (near Venice) published a fragment of an Armenian translation of the same. In 1891 a complete Syriac translation was made known by Rendel Harris; contemporaneously a Greek revision of the text was edited by Armitage Robinson. The latter text, which has reached us in the seventh-century romance of Barlaam and Joasaph (cc. 26—27)[7], offers many corrections, especially abridgments of the original. The Syriac translation has been accepted as a faithful and reliable witness of the original concept of the Apology. The Armenian translation was also made from the Greek, although it deals quite freely with the original, as may

[1] *Eus.,* Chron. ad a. Abrah. 2140: Hist. eccl., iv. 3, 1—2.

[2] Ib., iii. 37, 1; v. 17, 2.

[3] De viris illustr., c. 19: Ep. 70 ad Magnum, c. 4.

[4] *Eus.,* Hist. eccl., iv. 23, 3. [5] Ib., iv. 3, 2

[6] Chron. ad a. Abrah. 2140: Hist. eccl., iv. 3, 3; cf. *Hieron.,* De viris illustr., c. 20; Ep. 70, 4.

[7] *Migne,* PG., xcvi. 1108—1124.

be seen from the two chapters (1—2) of the preserved fragment. From the inscription of the Syriac translation it seems fairly certain that the original was offered to the Emperor Antoninus Pius (138—161). Eusebius, who seems not to have read it, believed that the Apology had been presented to Hadrian. The scope of the work is to prove that the Christians alone possess the true knowledge of God. After a brief exposition of the idea of God, as it is forced on the human mind by the study of nature (c. 1), the author invites the Emperor to look out upon the world and examine the faith in God exhibited by the different races of humanity, Barbarians, Greeks, Jews, and Christians (c. 2). The Barbarians adore God under the form of perishable and changeable elements (cc. 3—7): earth, water, fire, the winds, the sun; the Greeks attribute to their gods their own human frailties and passions (cc. 8—13); the Jews believe in one only God, but they serve angels rather than Him (c. 14). The Christians rejoice in the possession of the full truth, and manifest the same in their lives (cc. 15—17). The beautiful and highly emotional description of the Christian life closes[1] with a reference to their «writings».

The work of Aristides offers only rare echoes of the biblical writings, to which may be added some more or less clear traces of the Didache (§ 6) and of the Preaching of Peter (§ 30, 1). Specific Christian teachings are touched on very slightly, e. g. the Incarnation of the Son of God through a Hebrew Virgin (c. 2, 6) and the Second Coming of Christ in Judgment (c. 17, 8). There are extant in Armenian two other fragments that bear the name of Aristides: a homily «on the appeal of the (Good) Thief and the reply of the Crucified One» (Luke xxiii. 42 f.), and some lines of «a Letter to all philosophers by the philosopher Aristides». In spite of the favourable opinion of Zahn and Seeberg, the homily is not to be accounted authentic, while the pretended epistolary fragment seems no more than an enlarged citation from the Apology.

The Armenian fragment of the Apology and the Armenian homily were published by the Mechitarists under the title: S. Aristidis philosophi Atheniensis sermones duo, Venice, 1878. Both pieces were translated into German by *Fr. Sasse,* in Zeitschrift für kath. Theol. (1879), iii. 612—618 (cf. p. 816), and by *Fr. v. Himpel,* in Theol. Quartalschr. (1880), lxii. 109—127. A new edition of these Armenian texts, including the fragment of the Letter, was brought out by *P. Martin* in *Pitra,* Analecta sacra, tom. iv., Paris, 1883, Armenian text pp. 6—11, Latin translation pp. 282—286; cf. Proleg. pp. x—xi. *J. Rendel Harris* and *J. Armitage Robinson* published the Syriac version of the Apology from a codex of the sixth or seventh century, found in the monastery of St. Catharine on Mount Sinai, also the Greek recension, in Texts and Studies edited by *J. A. Robinson,* i. 1, Cambridge 1891, 1893. From another manuscript *Harris* translated into English (ib. pp. 29—33) the Armenian fragment of the Apology. See *D. M. Kay,* The Apology of Aristides the Philosopher, translated from the Greek and from

[1] c. 16, 3, 5; cf. 15, 1; 17, 1.

the Syriac Version in Ante-Nicene Fathers (Am. ed 1885), ix. 263—279. German translations of the Syriac version were made by *R. Raabe,* in Texte und Untersuchungen (Leipzig, 1892), ix. 1, and by *J. Schönfelder,* in Theol. Quartalschr. (1892), lxxiv. 531—557. Attempts to reconstruct the Greek original of the Apology have been made by *R. Seeberg,* in *Zahn's* Forschungen zur Gesch. des neutestamentl. Kanons (Erlangen, 1893), v. 159—414 (contains comprehensive and thorough researches), and by *Hennecke,* in Texte und Untersuchungen (Leipzig, 1893), iv. 3. Cf. *Hennecke,* Zur Frage nach der ursprünglichen Textgestalt der Aristides-Apologie, in Zeitschrift für wissenschaftl. Theol. (1893), ii. 42—126. *Seeberg* published, Erlangen 1894, a complete edition of the writings of Aristides. *L. Lemme,* Die Apologie des Aristides, in Neue Jahrbücher für deutsche Theol. (1893), ii. 303—340. *F. Lauchert,* Über die Apologie des Aristides, in Internat. Theol. Zeitschrift (1894), ii. 278—299. *P. Vetter,* Aristides-Citate in der armenischen Literatur, in Theol. Quartalschr. (1894), lxxvi. 529—539. In his Forschungen zur Gesch. des neutestamentl. Kanons (Erlangen, 1893), v. 415—437, *Zahn* defends the authenticity of the homily and the fragment of the Letter. *P. Pape,* in Texte und Untersuchungen (Leipzig, 1894), xii. 2, holds both to be spurious.

### § 16. Aristo of Pella.

The earliest Christian participant in the literary conflict with Judaism seems to have been Aristo of Pella (a town of the Decapolis in Palestine). Between 135 and 175 he published a small treatise entitled «A Disputation between Jason and Papiscus concerning Christ» *(Ἰάσονος καὶ Παπίσκου ἀντιλογία περὶ Χριστοῦ)*[1]. In this work Jason, a Jewish Christian, proved so conclusively the fulfilment of the Messianic prophecies in Jesus of Nazareth that his opponent, the Jew Papiscus, begged to be baptized. There are traces in Origen (l. c.) of the contents of the work (now lost to us), also in the extant introduction or *Epistola nuncupatoria* of an ancient Latin translation that has also perished[2]. The time of its composition may be approximately fixed: Celsus cites it (*Origen* l. c.) in his work against the Christians, written about 178. On the other hand, in a work whose title and contents are unknown to us, but which was very probably our Dialogue, Aristo of Pella makes mention of the issue of the Barkochba rebellion (132—135)[3]. The first to claim this work for Aristo of Pella was Maximus Confessor[4].

The «testimonia antiquorum» and the fragments are found in *Routh,* Reliquiae sacrae, i. 91—109; *de Otto,* Corpus apolog. christ., ix. 349 ad 363. Cf. *Harnack,* Gesch. der altchristl. Literatur, i. 92—95; ii. 1, 268 f. *P. Corssen* and *Th. Zahn* treat of the Dialogue of Aristo in their researches on the sources of the «Altercatio Simonis Judaei et Theophili Christiani», by Evagrius, in which text *Harnack* saw (1883) a translation or revision of the Dialogue of Aristo; cf. § 96, 1. In two Greek dialogues of

[1] *Orig.,* Contra Celsum, iv. 52.

[2] Ad Vigilium episcopum de iudaica incredulitate, in Opp. *S. Cypr.* (ed. *Hartel*), iii. 119—132.

[3] *Eus.,* Hist. eccl., iv. 6, 3.

[4] Scholia in *Dion. Areop.,* De myst. theol., c. 1.

the fourth or fifth century, first edited by him, Conybeare believes that he can recognize a recension of the work of Aristo: *Fr. C. Conybearc,* The Dialogues of Athanasius and Zachæus and of Timothy and Aquila, Oxford, 1898 (Anecd. Oxon., classical series, viii). For the text of the latter dialogue cf. *D. Tamilia,* De Timothei Christiani et Aquilae Iudaei dialogo, Rome, 1901.

## § 17. Justin Martyr.

1. HIS LIFE. — The habitual title of «philosophus et martyr» was first applied to Justin by Tertullian[1]. He calls himself «the son of Priscus, the son of Bacchius, of Flavia Neapolis», i. e. the ancient Sichem (modern Nablus) in Palestine[2]. He may have been born in the first decade of the second century; his parents were heathens[3]. He relates of himself that in his youth he was devoured by the thirst of knowledge and went from one philosophical school to another, visiting in turn the Stoics, the Peripatetics, the Pythagoreans, and the Platonists. After a lengthy stay with the latter he eventually found in Christianity the object of his desires[4] His conversion took place before the last Jewish War (132—135), perhaps at Ephesus[5]. As a Christian he clung to his peripatetic life, continued to wear the philosopher's mantle[6], and defended Christianity, by his speech and his writings, as «the only reliable and serviceable philosophy[7]». He spent considerable time at Rome, founded a school there, and convicted of ignorance the philosopher Crescens[8]. In the same city most probably he sealed his faith with his blood. According to the Acts of St. Justin his death took place under Junius Rusticus, Prefect of the City, between 163 and 167.

*C. Semisch,* Justin der Märtyrer. Eine kirchen- und dogmengeschichtliche Monographie, Breslau, 1840—1842, 2 voll. *J. C. Th. Otto,* in Encyclopedia of *Ersch* and *Gruber,* Sect. ii., part 30, Leipzig. 1853, pp. 39—76. *Ch. E. Freppel,* St. Justin, Paris, 1860, 3. ed. 1886. *Th. Zahn,* in Zeitschr. für Kirchengesch. (1885—1886), viii. 37—66. For the Acta SS. Justini et sociorum cf. § 59, 4. *C. Bertani,* Vita di S. Giustino, Monza, 1902. *A. L. Feder* S. J., Justins des Märtyrers Lehre von Jesus Christus, dem Messias und dem menschgewordenen Sohne Gottes. Eine dogmengeschichtliche Monographie, Freiburg, 1906.

2. HIS WRITINGS. — Justin is the most eminent of the apologetic writers of the second century Indeed, he is the first of the Fathers to develop a comprehensive literary activity He opposed with zeal not only heathenism, but also Judaism and heresy The manuscript-tradition of the writings he has bequeathed us exhibits many defects and gaps. Most of his writings are lost, while many writings that

[1] Adv. Valent., c. 5. [2] Apol., i. 1.
[3] Dial. cum Tryphone, c. 28. [4] Ib., c. 2—8; cf. Apol., ii. 12.
[5] Dial. cum Tryph., c. 1 9; cf. *Eus.*. Hist. eccl., iv. 18, 6.
[6] Ib., iv. 11, 8; cf. *Just.*, Dial. c. 1. [7] Dial. c. 8.
[8] Acta S. Justini, c. 3; *Eus.*, Hist. eccl., iv. 11, 11; Apol., ii. 3.

falsely bear his famous name have been preserved. Only three of the works current under his name have withstood the touchstone of criticism: the two Apologies, and the Dialogue with the Jew Trypho.

The Arethas-Codex (§ 13) contains only the spurious Epistola ad Zenam et Serenum (see below p. 54) and the equally spurious Cohortatio ad Gentiles (p. 53). Two other independent collections of the writings of Justin have reached us: the former Codex Argentorat. 9 (saec. xiii. or xiv.) destroyed in the siege of Strasburg (1870), and the (more copious but very much damaged) Codex Par. 450 (of the year 1364). All other copies of works of Justin, in so far as they have been studied, are reducible to these three manuscripts; cf. *Harnack*, Die Überlieferung der griechischen Apologeten des 2. Jahrh. (§ 13), pp. 73 ff. The first editor of the works of Justin, *R. Stephanus* (Paris, 1551), followed closely the text of Cod. Par. 450. The second editor, *Fr. Sylburg* (Heidelberg, 1593), changed the order of the writings, and added to them the Oratio ad Gentiles (p. 51) and the Letter to Diognetus (p. 52) both having been in the meantime made known to the learned world by *H. Stephanus* (Paris, 1592) from Cod. Argent. 9. The reader will find, in § 13, mention of the editions of *Morellus, Maranus (Gallandi, Migne)*, and *de Otto*. The latter edition appeared at Jena, 1842—1843, in three octavo volumes, and later, as part of the Corpus apologetarum, voll. i—v. 1847—1850, and 1876—1881.

3. THE TWO APOLOGIES. — In the Paris Codex (Gr. 450) of the year 1364, on which is based the text of the two Apologies, the shorter, now known as the second, holds the first place. However, its repeated references to a prior Apology (ii. 4 6 8) show that it is really the second. — Concerning the composition of the first Apology there has been no little discussion. Wehofer maintains that it is an oration disposed according to all the rules of contemporary rhetoric, notwithstanding an occasional wandering from the theme. Thus, there is a *prooemium* followed by a *propositio*, viz., that the name «Christian» cannot be condemned, since no evil can be proved against the Christians as such. In the first part of the dialogue (cc. 4—13), the *refutatio*, the author combats the accusations of impiety and civil enmity. In the second part (cc. 14—67), the *probatio* proper, he maintains that Christ, the founder of the Christian doctrine, is the Son of God; his principal arguments are drawn from the Jewish prophecies. In the *peroratio* he appeals to the imperial sense of justice and invokes as an example the edict of Hadrian to Minucius Fundanus concerning the treatment of the Christians (c. 68). Rauschen denies any intentionally artistic construction, but admits a division into two parts. The first (cc. 4—12) is chiefly negative, and aims at rebutting anti-Christian calumnies; the second (cc. 13—67) is more positive, and consists of an exposition and justification of the contents of the Christian religion. We learn from the uncertain and obscure inscription of the first Apology that it was dedicated to Antoninus Pius (138—161), his adoptive sons Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus, the Sacred Senate, and the entire Roman people. It describes as a philosopher

and a «friend of knowledge», not only Marcus Aurelius, but also Lucius Verus, born in 130. It would seem from several indications that this work was composed between 150 and 155. Thus Marcion is described (cc. 26 58) as an apostle of the demon; Felix is mentioned as prefect of Egypt (c. 29), and it is stated (c. 46) that Christ was born one hundred and fifty years ago.

The second or shorter Apology owed its origin to a very recent event (*χθὲς δὲ καὶ πρώην* c. 1). Three Christians had been put to death by Urbicus, the Prefect of Rome, merely for their profession of the new religion. The fact is related by Justin, who adds to his story certain paragraphs of an apologetic character, and concludes by asking the Emperors (c. 15; cf. c. 2) to publish the writer's previous Apology and to command the observance of justice in dealing with the Christians. It has been found impossible to discover any dominant idea or rhetorical order in this document, which is certainly no more than a supplement or appendix of the first Apology, written also very shortly after the composition of that work (cf. the references 4 6 8). Urbicus was City-Prefect between 144 and 160; we must be content for the present with this approximate knowledge, it is impossible to ascertain the exact date.

The two apologies were edited separately by *J. W. J. Braun,* Bonn, 1830, 1860, 3. ed. by *E. Gutberlet,* Leipzig, 1883; by *G. Krüger,* Freiburg, 1891 (Sammlung ausgewählter kirchen- und dogmengeschichtlicher Quellenschriften, i.), 2. ed. 1896. German translations of both have been made by *P. A. Richard,* Kempten, 1871 (Bibl. der Kirchenväter), and *H. Veil,* Strasburg, 1894 (with explanatory notes). For an English translation see *Dods, Reith* and *Roberts,* in Ante-Nicene Fathers (Am. ed. 1885), i. 163—302. For the date of composition and the relations between the two apologies cf. *G. Krüger,* in Jahrb. für protest. Theol. (1890), xvi. 579—593; *J. A. Cramer,* in Theol. Studien (1891), lxiv. 317—357, 401—436; *B. Grundl,* De interpolationibus ex S. Justini phil. et mart. Apologia secunda expungendis (Progr.), Augustae Vindel., 1891. The hypercriticism of Grundl is refuted by *F. Emmerich,* De Justini phil. et mart. Apologia altera (Diss. inaug.), Münster, 1896. *Th. M. Wehofer,* Die Apologie Justins des Phil. u. Märt., in literarhistorischer Beziehung zum erstenmal untersucht, Rome, 1897 (Römische Quartalschrift, Supplement 6). *G. Rauschen,* Die formale Seite der Apologien Justins, in Theol. Quartalschr. (1899), lxxxi. 188—206. *A. Lebentopulos,* Ἡ ά καὶ β' Ἀπολογία ὑπὲρ χριστιανῶν Ἰουστίνου φιλοσόφου καὶ μάρτυρος καὶ ὁ κατὰ Ἑλλήνων λόγος Ἀθανασίου τοῦ μεγάλου (Dissert.), Erlangen, 1901.

4. THE DIALOGUE WITH THE JEW TRYPHO. This work too, has come down to us only in the Paris Codex of 1364, and is moreover in an imperfect state. It wants the introduction, and the dedication to a certain Marcus Pompeius (c. 141). Also from chapter 74 a considerable fragment has dropped out. The work sums up a disputation held at Ephesus[1] (a fact very probably learned by Eusebius

[1] *Eus.,* Hist. eccl., iv. 18, 6.

from the lost introduction) during the then recent Jewish War (132 to 135: Dial. i. 9). The interlocutors were Justin and the Jew Trypho; the dialogue lasted for two days, and it is supposed that, correspondingly, the original work consisted of two books. With an artistic skill, that Zahn has finely brought out, the work includes both truth and fiction; it is in part made up of real discussions between Justin and learned Jews, and is in part a free and original study. It is quite probable that the Trypho who represents Judaism is none other than the celebrated contemporary Rabbi Tarpho. In the introduction (cc. 2—8) Justin describes the genesis of his own philosophico-religious opinions; in the first part (cc. 10—47) he proves from the Old Testament that the ritual Law of Moses has been abrogated in favour of the new Law of Christ; in the second part (cc. 48—108) he makes it clear from the prophecies of the Old Testament that the adoration of Jesus does not conflict with the fundamental doctrine of Monotheism, the adoration of the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob; in the third part (cc. 109—141), he seeks to prove that the true Israel is to be found in all those who have accepted Christianity, since the days of the Apostles at Jerusalem; to them belong the promises of the Old Covenant. In the Dialogue reference is made to the first Apology (c. 120); it must, therefore, have been composed after 150—155.

*Th. Zahn,* in Zeitschr. für Kirchengesch., viii. 37—66.

5. LOST WORKS OF JUSTIN. In the *Sacra Parallela* of St. John Damascene are preserved three lengthy fragments of a work of Justin on the Resurrection *(περὶ ἀναστάσεως)*, in which are refuted Gnostic objections against the resurrection of the body, and the proofs and guaranties of this ecclesiastical doctrine set forth. There are also other fragments bearing the name of Justin, but they are too brief and disconnected to permit a judgment as to their authenticity and right to a place among the writings of Justin. He refers himself (Apol. i. 26) to a previous work against heretics *(σύνταγμα κατὰ πασῶν τῶν γεγενημένων αἱρέσεων)*; as to its content we are reduced to conjectures based on other statements of Justin concerning heretics. St. Irenæus knew and used [1] a work of Justin against Marcion *(σύνταγμα πρὸς Μαρκίωνα)*; according to some it was a fragment of the above-cited work, according to others a special treatise. Eusebius [2] is the earliest witness to the authorship of the following writings: a Discourse against the Greeks *(λόγος πρὸς Ἕλληνας)* «in which he discusses at length most of the matters that are treated by us and by the Greek philosophers, and examines carefully the nature of the demons»; another work addressed to the Greeks under the title «Refutation» *(ἕτερον πρὸς Ἕλληνας σύγγραμμα, ὃ καὶ ἐπέγραψεν ἔλεγχον)*; a work on the unity of God *(περὶ θεοῦ μοναρχίας)* «based not only on our own writings but also on

[1] Adv. haer., iv. 6, 2. [2] Hist. eccl., iv. 18, 3 ff.

those of the Greeks»; a work entitled «Psalter» *(ψάλτης)*, a doctrinal treatise on the soul *(σχολικὸν περὶ ψυχῆς)*, «in which he describes various researches concerning the problem of the soul and gives the views of the Greek philosophers, with his promise to refute them in another work wherein his own views shall be set forth». The titles of the first three of these writings are identical with those of three works preserved in the manuscripts of the writings of St. Justin: *Oratio ad Gentiles (πρὸς Ἕλληνας)*, *Cohortatio ad Gentiles (λόγος παραινετικὸς πρὸς Ἕλληνας)*, and *De monarchia (περὶ θεοῦ μοναρχίας)*. The five short chapters of the *Oratio ad Gentiles,* devoted to a very energetic and efficient refutation of the unreasonable and immoral mythology of Homer and Hesiod, cannot be attributed to Justin, the style of the work differs from his too widely. Yet the little treatise may possibly belong to the second century At a later date a certain Ambrosius revised it; this revision has reached us in a Syriac translation. The *Cohortatio ad Gentiles,* a work in 38 chapters, undertakes to demonstrate, in an elegant, smooth and flowery style, that whatever truth is found in the writings of the Greek sages, poets and philosophers, was taken by them from the sacred books of the Jews. Both in form and content this work offers a striking contrast to the genuine writings of Justin. Very probably, however, it was composed at the end of the second or the beginning of the third century, though at present opinions differ very widely as to its origin. The author of the six chapters *De monarchia* undertakes to prove the unity of God and the inanity of the gods, mostly by forged citations from the Greek poets, and with no reference to the Scriptures. As the work is apparently complete in itself, it can hardly be the second part of the homonymous work of Justin referred to by Eusebius. Moreover, its diction differs notably from that of Justin. Possibly these three works were erroneously attributed to Justin by reason of above-mentioned statements of Eusebius. Possibly, too, Eusebius had before him works that wrongly bore the name of Justin. He says, expressly, that apart from the works mentioned by him «very many other works» circulated under the name of Justin.[1] St. John Damascene, Maximus Confessor, and Photius quote, indeed, still other works of Justin, but the sources of Christian literary tradition were by that time very deeply troubled[2].

Fragments that seem to have some claim to authenticity are collected in *de Otto,* Corpus apolog., iii. 210—265. On the fragments of *De resurrectione* re-edited by *K. Holl*, in Texte und Untersuchungen (1899), xx. 36—49, new series, v. 2, see *Zahn,* in Zeitschr. für Kirchengesch., viii. 20—37; *W. Bousset,* Die Evangeliencitate Justins des Mart., Göttingen, 1891, pp. 123—127. A later revision of the *Oratio ad Gentiles* was edited,

[1] Hist. eccl., iv. 18, 8.

[2] Sacra Parallela; *Migne,* PG., xci. 280; Bibl. Cod. 125.

in Syriac and English, from a seventh-century manuscript by *W. Cureton,* Spicilegium Syriacum, London, 1855, pp. 38—42, 61—69. In Sitzungsberichte der kgl. preuß. Akad. der Wissensch., Berlin, 1896, pp. 627—646, *Harnack* made known a German translation of the Syriac version, by *F. Baethgen,* and added the original text of the *Oratio,* with corrections.

The author of the *Cohortatio ad Gentiles*, according to *E. Schürer* (Zeitschr. für Kirchengesch. [1877—1878], ii. 319—331) borrowed from the «Chronography» of Julius Africanus; he, therefore, belongs to the second quarter of the third century. *D. Völter* on the contrary, in Zeitschr. für wissensch. Theol. (1883), xxvi. 180—215, is of opinion that it was written about 180, and presumably by Apollinaris of Hierapolis. *J. Dräseke,* in Zeitschr. für Kirchengeschichte (1884—1885), vii. 257—302, and Texte und Untersuchungen (1892), vii. 3—4, 83—99, thinks that its author was Apollinaris of Laodicea († ca. 390), and that its original title was ὑπερ ἀληθείας ἢ λόγος παραινετικὸς πρὸς Ἕλληνας. This line of thought was adopted by *J. R. Asmus,* in Zeitschr. für wissenschaftl. Theol. (1895), xxxviii. 115—155; (1897), xl. 268—284, and Zeitschr. für Kirchengesch. (1895—1896), xvi. 45—71, 220—252; he contends that in the *Cohortatio* Apollinaris of Laodicea is attacking the infamous scholastic ordinance of Julian the Apostate, made in 362; in turn, the Emperor was aiming at the *Cohortatio* in his work against the Christians. *A. Puech,* in Mélanges, Henri Weil, Paris, 1898, 395—406, places the date of the *Cohortatio* between 260 and 300. *W Widmann,* Die Echtheit der Mahnrede Justins des Märtyrers an die Heiden (Forschungen zur christl. Literatur und Dogmengeschichte), Mainz, 1902, iii. 1 (the Cohortatio is a genuine work of Justin). *W Gaul,* Die Abfassungsverhältnisse der pseudo-justinischen *Cohortatio ad Graecos,* Berlin, 1902. For false accounts of the discovery of the work of Justin on the soul (περὶ ψυχῆς), mentioned by Eusebius, cf. *H. Diels,* in Sitzungsberichte der kgl. preuß. Akad. der Wissensch,, Berlin, 1891, pp. 151—153.

6. SPURIOUS WRITINGS. Apart from the three works mentioned above (p. 52), several other works have reached us that are erroneously ascribed to Justin. We shall speak in § 22 of the Letter to Diognetus. The *Expositio fidei seu De Trinitate* is a doctrinal exposition of the Trinity and of Christology that has reached us in two recensions of unequal length. Funk has shown, against Dräseke, that the original recension is the longer one, and that it belongs to the fifth century, not to the time of Apollinaris of Laodicea. There exist at present some fragments of a revision of this work in Syriac and in Old-Slavonic. The *Epistola ad Zenam et Serenum* is an exhortation and guide to Christian asceticism; according to a conjecture of Batiffol, it was written in the time of St. John Chrysostom by Sisinnius, the Novatian bishop of Constantinople. The *Quaestiones et responsiones ad orthodoxos,* a collection of 146 questions and answers of a miscellaneous theological nature, are a work of the fifth century (cf. Quaest. 71). Of the same date, perhaps, are the *Quaestiones Christianorum ad Gentiles,* apologetical studies concerning God and His relations to the world, and the *Quaestiones Gentilium ad Christianos,* equally metaphysical and theological in contents, and supposed to be from the same hand. The *Confutatio dogmatum quorundam Aristotelicorum* is directed chiefly against some principles of Aristo-

telian physics. There are also a few other small fragments of works wrongly attributed to St. Justin.

*J. Dräseke* has several times attempted to prove that the short recension of the *Expositio fidei* is a work of Apollinaris of Laodicea, in Zeitschr. für Kirchengesch. (1883—1884), vi. 1—45, 503—549; also Jahrb. für protest. Theol. (1887), xiii. 671 ff. He finally edited it under the latter's name, in Texte und Untersuchungen, vii. 3—4, 353—363, cf. 158—182. The thesis is utterly untenable; as *Funk* has shown, in Theol. Quartalschr. (1896), lxxviii, 116—147, 224—250. These articles are reprinted in *Funk,* Kirchengeschichtl. Abhandlungen und Untersuchungen (1899), ii. 253—291. In *Pitra's* Analecta sacra, iv., Paris, 1883, *P. Martin* made known fragments of a Syriac revision of the *Expositio fidei* (Syriac text, pp. 11—16, and Latin translation, pp. 287—292). For the Old-Slavonic recension of the same, cf. *N Bonwetsch,* in *Harnack,* Gesch. der altchristl. Lit., i. 892 f. For the *Epistola ad Zenam et Serenum* cf. *P. Batiffol,* in Revue Biblique (1986), v. 114—122. The *Quaestiones et responsa ad orthodoxos* were edited once more by *A. Papadopulos-Kerameus,* St. Petersburg, 1895, from a tenth-century codex, in which they are attributed to Theodoret of Cyrus. Cf. on them *W. Gaß,* in Zeitschr. für die historische Theologie (1842), xii. 4, 35—154. *Dräseke,* in Jahrb. für protest. Theol. (1884), x. 347—352, believes that there are fragments of the writings of Apollinaris of Laodicea in the *Fragmenta Pseudo-Justini* published by *de Otto,* Corpus Apolog., v, 368—375. *A. Harnack* has vindicated for Diodorus of Tarsus the authorship of the «Quaestiones et responsiones ad orthodoxos»; cf. his *Diodor von Tarsus,* Vier pseudojustinische Schriften als Eigentum Diodors nachgewiesen (Texte und Untersuchungen, new series, vi. v), Leipzig, 1901. This work contains a German version of the first three writings and of the more important portions of the fourth: *Quaestiones et responsiones ad orthodoxos, Quaestiones Gentilium ad Christianos, Quaestiones Christianorum ad Gentiles,* and *Confutatio dogmatum Aristotelis.* If *Harnack's* arguments do not furnish a splendid and irrefutable demonstration, as *F Diekamp* thinks, in Theologische Revue (1902), i. 53, they create at least a very strong probability in favour of Diodorus of Tarsus. *Funk,* Le pseudo-Justin et Diodore de Tarse, in Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique (1902), iii. 947—971, thinks that the «Quaestiones et responsa» attributed by *Harnack* to Diodorus are not earlier than the middle of the fifth century. The statement which ascribes them to Theodoret of Cyrus needs closer investigation.

7 THE AUTHENTIC WRITINGS OF JUSTIN. The notable disagreement concerning the contents and structure of his writings is owing, in part at least, to a peculiar defect in the same: there is wanting in them an orderly movement of thought. Justin is an impressionist. He rarely tarries long enough to exhaust an idea, preferring to take up other threads before returning to his original theme. Thus, correlated subjects are scattered, and ideas which have little mutual affinity are brought together. Moreover, he pays slight attention to beauty of diction. His writings abound in solecisms and neologisms; he delights in long periods and frequent participial construction; at times he falls into a rigid monotony that is positively fatiguing. At times, however, especially in dialogue, his diction takes on more life, exhibits a certain power and emotion, and even rises to a certain

sublimity. As already indicated (p. 49), Justin continued to follow, after his conversion, the profession of philosopher. He is the first, and among the most eminent, of those Fathers who undertook to bring about a reconciliation between Christianity and pagan science. At the same time, it is only by a partisan distortion of his teaching that some modern writers, like Aubé and von Engelhardt, find in it a strange mixture of Christian and pagan-philosophical elements, to which Platonism rather than Christianity, has lent both form and colouring. Justin is a Christian philosopher, thoroughly conscious that with his faith in the Son of God he has entered a new sphere of truth, has come to possess the fulness of truth. For him Christianity is the rule by which he measures the data of philosophy; it is, in all simplicity, the truth itself; hence in turn all truth is Christian (Apol. ii. 13). The same Word (Logos) who was manifested fully in Christ, is germinally (as *λόγος σπερματικός*) in every human soul. In the measure of their participation in this Word of God, the philosophers and poets of antiquity were able to know the truth (Apol. ii. 8, 13). All those who have lived with the Word *(οἱ μετὰ λόγου βιώσαντες)* were Christian, even though they were held to be atheists; such e. g. were Socrates, Heraclitus, and their peers among the Greeks; Abraham, Ananias, Azarias, Misael, Elias, and many others among the Barbarians (Apol. i. 46). It is through the Old Testament that other germs of truth *(σπέρματα ἀληθείας)* were made known to the Greeks. Plato borrowed from Moses the doctrine of moral freedom; similarly it was from the Hebrew prophets that the Greek writers obtained such knowledge as they had concerning the immortality of the soul, future retribution, heaven, and the like (Apol. i. 44). Thereby the relation of pagan culture to Christianity was at least distinctly outlined. The faith of Christians, according to Justin, is found in the books of the Old Testament, particularly in the prophets. their words are for him the words of God, or the Logos, or the Holy Spirit (Apol. i. 33 36 61). The Gospels he cites usually as «memoirs of the Apostles» *(ἀπομνημονεύματα τῶν ἀποστόλων)*; thereby he, at least, suggests that Christians held them for inspired and canonical books (*ἀναγινώσκεται* Apol. i. 67; *γέγραπται* Dial. c. 49). The Apocalypse is declared to be a divinely revealed book and written by the Apostle John (Dial. c. 81). There are also in Justin echoes of the Acts of the Apostles, of all the Pauline Epistles (excepting the Epistle to Philemon), of the Epistle of St. James, the two Epistles of St. Peter, and the first Epistle of St. John. The account of Christian liturgical customs furnished by Justin (Apol. i. 61 ff.) is of very great importance; he oversteps in these paragraphs the limits of the Discipline of the Secret, and describes with much detail both baptism and the celebration of the Eucharist. No other Christian apologist imitated him in this disclosure of the greatest of Christian mysteries.

*B. Aubé*, Essai de critique religieuse. De l'apologétique chrétienne au IIe siècle. St. Justin phil. et mart., Paris, 1861, 1875. *C. Weizsäcker*, Die Theologie des Märtyrers Justinus, in Jahrb. für deutsche Theol. (1867), xii. 60—119. *M. v. Engelhardt*, Das Christentum Justins des Märtyrers. Eine Untersuchung über die Anfänge der katholischen Glaubenslehre. Erlangen, 1878. Cf., against Engelhardt, *A. Stählin*, Justin der Märtyrer und sein neuester Beurteiler, Leipzig, 1880. *J. Sprinzl*, Die Theologie des hl. Justinus des Märtyrers. Eine dogmengeschichtl. Studie, in Theol.-prakt. Quartalschrift (1884—1886). *C. Clemen*, Die religionsphilosophische Bedeutung des stoisch-christlichen Eudämonismus in Justins Apologie, Studien und Vorarbeiten, Leipzig, 1890. *F. Bosse*, Der präexistente Christus des Justinus Martyr, eine Episode aus der Geschichte des christologischen Dogmas (Dissert. inaug.), Greifswald, 1891. *W. Flemming*, Zur Beurteilung des Christentums Justins des Märtyrers, Leipzig, 1893. *K. L. Grube*, Darlegung der hermeneutischen Grundsätze Justins des Märtyrers (reprinted from Katholik), Mainz, 1880. *Th. Zahn*, Gesch. des neutestamentl. Kanons (1889), i. 2, 463—585 «Justinus Martyr und die Apostolischen Schriften». *W. Bousset*, Die Evangeliencitate Justins des Märtyrers in ihrem Wert für die Evangelienkritik von neuem untersucht, Göttingen, 1891. *A. Baldus*, Das Verhältnis Justins des Märtyrers zu unseren synoptischen Evangelien, Münster, 1895. *W. Bornemann*, Das Taufsymbol Justins des Märtyrers, in Zeitschr. für Kirchengesch. (1878—1879), iii. 1—27. *J. Wilpert*, Fractio panis, Freiburg, 1895, pp. 42—65: «Die eucharistische Feier zur Zeit des hl. Justinus Martyr». The extraordinary assertion of Harnack, in Texte und Untersuch. (1891), vii. 2, 115—144, that Justin taught bread and water to be the «matter» of the Blessed Eucharist has met with no acceptance. Cf. *Th. Zahn*, Brot und Wein im Abendmahl der alten Kirche, Erlangen and Leipzig, 1892; *Funk*, in Theol. Quartalschr. (1892), lxxiv 643—659, and again in Kirchengeschichtl. Abhandl. und Untersuch. (1897), i. 278—292; *A. Jülicher*, in Theol. Abhandl. C. v. Weizsäcker gewidmet, Freiburg, 1892, pp. 215—250. *E. Lippelt*, Quae fuerint Justini martyris ἀπομνημονεύματα quaque ratione cum forma Evangeliorum syro-latina consenserint (Diss.), Halle, 1901. *J. A. Cramer*, Die Logosstellen in Justins Apologie kritisch untersucht, in Zeitschrift für die neutestamentl. Wissensch. (1901), ii. 300—338. Cramer maintains that the passages relative to the Logos are not from the pen of Justin, but were interpolated through the combination of the Apology with a Judæo-Christian work of Alexandrine origin. *Id.*, De Logosleer in de Pleitreden von Justins, in Theol. Tijdsscrift (1902), xxxvi. 114—159. *W. Liese*, Justinus Martyr in seiner Stellung zum Glauben und zur Philosophie, in Zeitschr. für kath. Theol. (1902), xxvi. 560—570.

## § 18. Tatian the Assyrian.

1. HIS LIFE. — Tatian, «born in the land of the Assyrians», belongs to the Syrian race. He had travelled extensively, and had earned the reputation of a philosopher and a writer, before he became a Christian at Rome. This must have taken place previous to the death of Justin (163—167). Irenæus is witness that Tatian was a «hearer» of Justin, and belonged to the Christian community at Rome until the latter's death. Later, probably in 172, Tatian abandoned the Church, joined the Gnostics, more particularly the Encratites, and returned to the East. Antioch (Syria), Cilicia, and Pisidia are

mentioned as the scenes of his activity. We are quite ignorant of the time and place of his death[1].

*H. A. Daniel,* Tatianus der Apologet, Halle, 1837 *Th. Zahn,* Tatians Diatessaron, in Forschungen zur Gesch. des neutestamentl. Kanons, Erlangen, 1881, i. 268 ff. *Ad. Harnack,* Die Überlieferung der griechischen Apologeten (cf. § 13), pp. 196—232. In his Gesch. der altchristl. Literatur, ii. 1, 284 ff., Harnack has more or less completely withdrawn his earlier views concerning the date of Tatian. *F X. Funk,* Zur Chronologie Tatians, in Theol. Quartalschr. (1883), lxv. 219—233, and again in his Kirchengeschichtl. Abhandlungen und Untersuchungen (1899), ii. 142—152

2. THE APOLOGY. — Only one work of Tatian has been preserved, an Apology for Christianity or rather a criticism of Hellenism, entitled *Πρὸς Ἕλληνας (Oratio ad Graecos).* It begins brusquely with a refutation of the prejudices of the Greeks (cc. 1—4), and proceeds to establish two lines of argument in favour of Christianity: its sublime doctrine (cc. 4—31), and its very great antiquity (cc. 31—41). In the first part he combines with his exposition of Christian teaching concerning God and the world, sin and redemption, a satire of the opposite errors of the Greeks; at the end (cc. 22—29) he quite gives up the role of an apologist to enter upon that of a polemical writer. The second part of his work is devoted to proving that, though Homer marks the beginnings of Greek civilization, art, and science, Moses antedates him by four hundred years. Therefore, even those «wise men» of Greece who preceded Homer are more modern than Moses. As a disciple of Justin his apologetic coincides in many points with that of his master, while in other points there is a notable difference. Justin treats the thinkers and poets of Greece with great respect; his disciple Tatian goes out of his way to belittle and insult them. He abounds in bitter and excessive denunciation, and ignores entirely all the praiseworthy features of Greek culture. In his Apology there is revealed, even more clearly than in his own career, a character harsh and passionate, and inclined to extreme measures. His style, likewise, is generally rough and disjointed, though occasionally, owing to the strength and ardour of his conviction, it assumes a poetic loftiness. The purpose of his Apology was to justify his conversion to Christianity, shortly after which event it was published, probably outside Rome (c. 35), and about 165, when Justin had already passed away (cc. 18. 19). His doctrinal thought is markedly influenced by Stoicism; it also abounds in phrases and turns of expression capable of being interpreted as contrary to the doctrines of the Church. Christ, however, is emphatically declared to be God (cc. 13 21). In a very difficult passage however (c. 5) on the procession of the Word, he clearly teaches subordinationism.

[1] *Tat.,* Orat., cc. 1 42 29 35; *Clem. Al.,* Strom., iii. 12, 81; *Epiph.,* Haer., xlvi. 1; *Iren.,* Adv. haer., i. 28, 1; *Eus.,* Chron. ad a. Abraham 2188.

We owe the preservation of the Apology to the Arethas-Codex (§ 13). Unfortunately the quaternions of this codex which contained it were torn out between the twelfth and the fourteenth century; in their place we only have three copies of the codex made in the eleventh and twelfth centuries. The *editio princeps* is that of *J. Frisius (C. Gessner)*, Zürich, 1546. On the editions of *Morellus, Maranus (Gallandi, Migne), de Otto* (Corpus apolog. vi.), cf. § 13. The most recent edition is that of *Ed. Schwartz* (Texte und Untersuchungen, iv. 1), Leipzig, 1888. Recent German versions are those of *J. Gröne,* Kempten, 1872 (Bibl. der Kirchenväter), and of *Harnack* in a Programme of the University of Gießen (Aug. 25., 1884). There is an English translation of the *Oratio* by *J. E. Ryland* in Ante-Nicene Fathers (Am. ed. 1885), ii. 65—83. *G. Dembowski,* Die Quellen der christl. Apologetik des 2. Jahrh., part I: Die Apologie Tatians, Leipzig, 1878. *B. Ponschab,* Tatians Rede an die Griechen (Progr.), Metten, 1895. *R. C. Kukula,* Tatians sog. Apologie, Leipzig, 1900. *P. Fiebig,* in Zeitschr. für Kirchengeschichte (1901), xxi. 149—159. *W Steuer,* Die Gottes- und Logoslehre des Tatian, Gütersloh, 1893. *A. Kalkmann,* Tatians Nachrichten über Kunstwerke, in Rheinisches Museum für Philol., new series (1887), xlii. 489—524. *R. Kukula,* Altersbeweis und Künstlerkatalog in Tatians Rede an die Griechen (Progr.), Wien, 1900. *A. Puech,* Recherches sur le discours aux Grecs de Tatien suivies d'une traduction du discours, avec notes, Paris, 1903. *H. U. Meyboom,* Tatianus en zijne Apologie, in Theol. Tijdschrift (1903), xxxvii. 193—247

3. THE DIATESSARON. — There is extant, at least in fragments, a second work of Tatian, the so-called Diatessaron. It was a Gospel-harmony, or story of the life and works of Our Lord compiled from the four canonical Gospels. The Greeks[1] called it *τὸ διὰ τεσσάρων εὐαγγέλιον*; by the Syrians it was entitled the «Evangelion da Mepharreshe»[2]. Its chronology was framed on that of the fourth Gospel, the first verses of which served as an introduction. The genealogies were left out[3], and in their place a few apocryphal additions were inserted. This work is an important witness to the authority of the four canonical Gospels, and was composed by Tatian in the last years of his life, after his apostasy, probably not in Greek but in Syriac, though it was based on the Greek text of the Gospels. During the whole third century, this harmony was the only Gospel text in use throughout many Christian communities of Syria, particularly at Edessa. It was only after the middle of the fourth century that the «Gospel of the Mixed» gradually gave way, perforce, to the «Gospel of the Separated», i. e. to the four Gospels. Between 360 and 370, St. Ephraem Syrus wrote a commentary on the Diatessaron of Tatian; Theodoret of Cyrus, who died about 458, found it necessary to remove from the churches of his diocese more than two hundred copies of this work, in the place of which he put the Syriac version of the four Gospels (Theod. l. c.). It is possible to partially reconstruct the Diatessaron by means of the commentary of St. Ephraem, whose original Syriac text, however,

[1] *Eus.*, Hist. eccl., iv. 29, 6; *Theodor.*, Haeret. fab. comp., i. 20.
[2] i. e. Gospel of the Mixed. [3] Mt. i. 1 ff.; Lk. iii. 23 ff.

is lost, and is represented by an Armenian version. For this purpose some Syriac fragments are also accessible, together with two later revisions of the Diatessaron: one in Latin, preserved in the Codex Fuldensis of the Vulgate, written at Capua about 545, and one in Arabic, more recent in date, it is true, but decidedly nearer to the original text.

The reconstruction of the Diatessaron in *Zahn,* Tatians Diatessaron, 1881, pp. 112—219, is based chiefly on the Latin version of the commentary of Ephraem made by *J. B. Aucher* and published by *G. Mösinger,* Venice, 1876. Cf. § 82, 5 for the more recent contributions to our knowledge of this commentary made by *J. Rendel Harris* and *J. H. Hill.* The Latin version is the work of an anonymous writer who lived about 500 and used the Latin text of the Gospels, revised by St. Jerome about 383. Victor, bishop of Capua, who died in 554, caused this recension to be inserted in the Codex Fuldensis of the New Testament Vulgate, written under his supervision; it there took the place of the four Gospels. In the preface Victor speaks of the data furnished by Eusebius concerning the Diatessaron of Tatian (Hist. eccl., iv. 29, 6) and of the attempts of Ammonius of Alexandria (*Eus.,* Ep. ad Carpianum) to compile a harmony This explains why this Latin Gospel-harmony is sometimes printed under the name of Tatian, and again (*Migne,* PL., lxviii. 251—358) under that of Ammonius. There is an excellent edition of the Codex Fuldensis by *E. Ranke,* Marburg and Leipzig, 1868. *Fr. P. A.* (later Cardinal) *Ciasca* edited the Arabic revision, Rome, 1888, from two manuscripts, and added a Latin translation. Mr. and Mrs. *H. W Hogg* translated the Arabic text into English in the Ante-Nicene Christian Library (additional volume), Edinburgh, 1897, pp. 33—138. Some new Syriac fragments were published by *H. Goussen,* in Studia theologica, Leipzig, 1895, i. 62—67. Amid the copious literature on the Diatessaron the book of *Zahn,* cited above, is especially worthy of mention. Cf. the continuation of Zahn's own studies, in his Forschungen zur Geschichte des neutestamentl. Kanons (1883), ii. 286—299, and in his Geschichte des neutestamentl. Kanons (1888), i. 1, 369—429; (1892), ii. 2, 530—556. Cf. also *J. P P. Martin,* in Revue des questions historiques (1883), xxxiii. 349—394; (1888), xliv. 5– 50. On the Arabic version the reader may consult *E. Sellin* in *Zahn,* Forschungen zur Gesch. des neutestamentl. Kanons (1891), iv 225—246. «Zur Geschichte von Tatian's Diatessaron im Abendland» cf. *Zahn,* in Neue kirchl. Zeitschr. (1894), v. 85—120. *M. Maher,* Recent Evidence for the Authenticity of the Gospels: Tatian's Diatessaron, London, 1893. *A. Hjelt,* Die altsyrischen Evangelien-Übersetzungen und Tatians Diatessaron, besonders in ihrem gegenseitigen Verhältnis untersucht, Leipzig, 1901. *H. Gressmann,* Studien zum syrischen Tetraevangelium, i., in Zeitschr. für die neutestamentl. Wissenschaft (1904), pp. 175, 248—252. *F. Crawford Burkitt,* Evangelion da Mepharreshe, The Curetonian Version of the Four Gospels, with the readings of the Sinai Palimpsest and the Early Syriac Patristic Evidence, etc., Cambridge University Press, 1904, i. xix, 556; ii (introduction and notes) vii, 322. *J. F. Stenning,* (art.) «Diatessaron» in *Hastings'* Dict. of the Bible (extra vol., 1904) pp. 451—461.

4. LOST WRITINGS. — Other works of Tatian have entirely perished. He mentions in his Apology (c. 15) a work «On animals» *(περὶ ζῴων)*, and another (c. 16) in which he treated of the nature of demons. He promised a book (c. 40) «Against those who have treated of divine things» *(πρὸς τοὺς ἀποφηναμένους τὰ περὶ θεοῦ)*, per-

haps a refutation of heathen anti-Christian calumnies. Rhodon, a disciple of Tatian, mentions[1] a «Book of problems» *(προβλημάτων βιβλίον)*, in which Tatian undertook to demonstrate the existence of errors and antilogies in the Sacred Scriptures (of the Old Testament). Clement of Alexandria mentions and refutes[2] a work of Tatian «On perfection according to the precepts of the Saviour» *(περὶ τοῦ κατὰ τὸν σωτῆρα καταρτισμοῦ)*. We learn from Eusebius[3] that «Metaphrases» or corrections of certain sayings of St. Paul were attributed to Tatian.

The «testimonia» relative to the lost writings are to be found in the current editions of the «Oratio»; *de Otto,* pp. 164 sq., and *Schwartz,* pp. 48 sq.

### § 19. Miltiades. Apollinaris of Hierapolis. Melito of Sardes.

1. MILTIADES. — Miltiades of Asia Minor was a contemporary of Tatian, and perhaps also a disciple of Justin[4] He defended the Christian truth against pagans, Jews and heretics, but all his writings have fallen a prey to time. We know from later writers that he composed a work against the Montanists[5] in which he sought to prove that a prophet should not speak in ecstacy *(περὶ τοῦ μὴ δεῖν προφήτην ἐν ἐκστάσει λαλεῖν)*, and another against the Valentinian Gnostics (Tert. l. c.), also a work in two books against the heathens *(πρὸς Ἕλληνας)*, another in two books against the Jews *(πρὸς Ἰουδαίους)*, and an Apology for «Christian philosophy» addressed to «temporal rulers»[6].

The «testimonia» relative to Miltiades are given by *de Otto,* Corpus Apolog., ix. 364—373; cf. *Harnack,* Geschichte der altchristl. Literatur, i. 255 ff.; ii. 1, 361 ff.

2. APOLLINARIS. — Claudius Apollinaris, bishop of Hierapolis, in the reign of Marcus Aurelius, left a number of works. Eusebius mentions[7] a «Defence of the Christian faith» presented to Marcus Aurelius, apparently in 172, five books against the Pagans *(πρὸς Ἕλληνας)*, two books on Truth *(περὶ ἀληθείας)*, a Circular Letter against the Montanists with the «subscriptions» or opinions of other bishops, a work On Easter[8] *(περὶ τοῦ πάσχα)*, and one on Religion *(περὶ εὐσεβείας)*[9], identical perhaps with the «Defence of the Christian faith». All of these writings have perished.

[1] *Eus.,* Hist. eccl., v. 13, 8. [2] Strom., iii. 12, 81.
[3] Hist. eccl., iv. 29, 6.
[4] *Tertull.,* Adv. Valent., c. 5; *Hippolytus* in *Eus.,* Hist. eccl., v. 28, 4.
[5] Anonym. apud *Eus.* l. c., v. 17, 1. [6] *Eus.* l. c., v. 17, 5.
[7] Ib., iv. 26, 1; 27; Chron. ad a. Abraham 2187: Hist. eccl., iv. 27; ib., v. 19.
[8] It is twice cited in the Chronicon Paschale, ed. *Dindorf,* pp. 13—14.
[9] *Phot.,* Bibl. Cod. 14.

The «testimonia» and fragments are in *Routh,* Reliquiae Sacrae, 2. ed., i. 155—174; *de Otto* l. c., ix. 479—495. Cf. *Harnack* l. c., i. 243—246; ii. 1, 358 sq.; *Zahn,* Forschungen zur Gesch. des neutestamentl. Kanons, (1893), v. 3 sq.

3. MELITO. — Still more extensive and varied was the literary activity of a third native of Asia Minor, Melito, bishop of Sardes in Lydia. He died before 194—195 «a eunuch» (i. e. unmarried), and «in all his life and works filled with the Holy Spirit», widely honoured also as a prophet[1]. Eusebius and Anastasius Sinaita were acquainted with the following works of Melito: a) a brief Apology for the Christian faith, presented to Marcus Aurelius perhaps in 172, some fragments of which are extant[2]; b) two books on Easter *(περὶ τοῦ πάσχα)* composed during the proconsulate of Servilius Paulus, or rather, as Rufinus states, in that of Sergius Paulus, perhaps 166—167 (*Eus.,* Hist. eccl. iv. 26, 2—3); c) On the Right Way of Living and the Prophets (*περὶ πολιτείας καὶ προφητῶν, id.* l. c. iv. 26, 2; *Hier* l. c.: De vita prophetarum), probably a work against Montanism; d) On the Church *(περὶ ἐκκλησίας, Eus.:* e) On Sunday *(περὶ κυριακῆς id.)*; f) On the Nature of Man *(περὶ φύσεως, al. πίστεως, ἀνθρώπου, id.)*; g) On the Creation of Man *(περὶ πλάσεως, id.)*; h) On the Obedience of Faith *(περὶ ὑπακοῆς πίστεως, id.)*; i) On the Senses *(περὶ ὑπακοῆς πίστεως αἰσθητηρίων, id.).* According to other text-witnesses this title is corrupt, and contains really two titles; k) On Baptism *(περὶ λουτροῦ, id.)*; l) On Truth *(περὶ ἀληθείας, id.)*, m) On the Creation and Birth of Christ *(περὶ κτίσεως καὶ γενέσεως Χριστοῦ, id.)*; n) On Prophecy *(περὶ προφητείας, id.; Rufinus,* Prophetia eius; *Hier.,* De prophetia sua, probably against Montanism); o) On Hospitality *(περὶ φιλοξενίας, Eus.)*; p) The Key *(Ἡ κλείς, id.)*; q) On the Devil *(περὶ τοῦ διαβόλου, id.)*; r) On the Revelation of John *(περὶ τοῦ διαβόλου καὶ τῆς ἀποκαλύψεως Ἰωάννου, id., Rufinus,* De diabolo, De revelatione Ioannis, *Hier.,* De diabolo, De apocalypsi Ioannis); s) On the Corporeity of God *(περὶ ἐνσωμάτου θεοῦ, Eus.; περὶ τοῦ ἐνσώματον εἶναι τὸν θεόν, Orig.,* Sel. in Gen. ad i. 26); t) Extracts *(Ἐκλογαί, Eus.),* i. e. «Extracts from the Law and the Prophets concerning our Saviour and our entire faith» in six books. Eusebius gives (l. c. iv 26, 12—14) the preface of the work; u) On the Passion of the Lord (*εἰς τὸ πάθος, Anast. Sin.,* Viae dux, c. 12, a short citation), v) On the Incarnation of Christ *(περὶ σαρκώσεως Χριστοῦ),* an anti-Marcionite work, in at least three books, *id.* l. c. c. 13, a rather long citation. All these works are lost. Besides the already cited fragments there remain four scholia on the sacrifice of Isaac as a type of the Crucifixion of Christ. They were taken, probably, from the «Extracts» mentioned by Eusebius, but were

[1] *Polycr.* in *Eus.,* Hist. eccl., v. 24, 5. *Tertull.* in *Hier.,* De vir. ill. c. 24.

[2] *Eus.,* Hist. eccl., iv. 13, 8; 26, 1—2; 5—11; Chron. ad a. Abr. 2187; Chron. Pasch. ed. *Dindorf,* 483.

already corrupted by spurious additions. There is also an interesting fragment on the baptism of the Lord in the Jordan, very probably from the homonymous work in the catalogue of Eusebius. Four fragments, preserved in Syriac only, ought to be considered as belonging to Melito: *ex Tractatu de anima et corpore, ex Sermone de cruce, De fide, Melitonis episcopi urbis Atticae;* in other codices, it is true, they bear the name of Alexander of Alexandria († 328). On the other hand, Melito is not the author of an Apology that has come down to us in Syriac, entitled *Oratio Melitonis philosophi quae habita est coram Antonino Caesare.* It is an energetic polemic against polytheism and idolatry, akin to the Apology of the Athenian Aristides, very probably of Syriac origin, and belonging to the end of the second or the beginning of the third century; and the Syriac text is probably not a translation but the original. An Armenian fragment of four lines, *ex Melitonis epistola ad Eutrepium,* and several Latin treatises, *De passione S. Joannis Evangelistae, De transitu B. Mariae Virginis, Clavis Scripturae, Catena in Apocalypsin,* are wrongly ascribed to him. Cardinal Pitra, the editor of the extensive *Clavis Scripturae,* tried to recognize in it a translation or rather a revision and enlargement of the «Key» of Melito, mentioned in Eusebius. In reality it is a biblical glossary compiled from Augustine, Gregory the Great, and other Latin Fathers. At the present it cannot be more precisely dated; we know however that no attempt was made to identify it with the «Key» before the eleventh century.

The «testimonia» and the fragments are in *Routh* l. c., i. 111—153; *de Otto* l. c., ix. 374—478, 497—512. Cf. *Harnack* l. c., i. 246—255; ii. 1, 358 ff., 517 ff., 522 ff. *C. Thomas,* Melito von Sardes, Osnabrück, 1893. The Greek fragment «on Baptism» was edited by *Pitra,* Analecta Sacra (1884), ii. 3—5; for its textual criticism see *J. M. Mercati,* in Theol. Quartalschr. (1894), lxxvi. 597—600.

The Syriac Apology and the four Syriac fragments were first edited by *W. Cureton,* Spicilegium Syriacum, London, 1855. All these fragments, Syriac and Latin (with exception of the fourth), as edited by *E. Renan,* are to be found in *Pitra,* Spicil. Solesm. (1855), ii. *de Otto* gives (l. c.) all the Syriac fragments (pp. 497—512), also the Latin (pp. 419—432); cf. pp. 453—478. There is a German version of the Apology (from the Syriac) by *B. Welte,* in Theol. Quartalschr. (1862), xliv. 384—410, and another from the Latin version of *v. Otto,* by *V. Gröne,* in Bibliothek der Kirchenväter, Kempten, 1873. For the Apology cf. *Harnack* l. c., ii. 1, 522 ff., and the literature there indicated. On the four fragments see *G. Krüger,* in Zeitschr. für wissenschaftl. Theol. (1888), xxxi. 434—448; *Thomas* l. c., pp. 40—51. The four Armenian lines *ex Melitonis epistola ad Eutrepium* are in *Pitra,* Analecta Sacra (1883), iv. 16 292. The *Clavis Scripturae* was twice edited by *Pitra:* in its longer form in Spicil. Solesm. (1855), ii—iii. 1, and in the shorter, more original form, in Analecta Sacra (1884), ii. For more specific information see *O. Rottmanner,* in Theol. Quartalschr. (1896), lxxviii. 614—629. For the other Latin writings mentioned above cf. *Harnack* l. c., i. 252—254. *H. Jordan,* Melito und Novatian, in Archiv für latein. Lexikographie und Grammatik (1902), xii. 59—68.

### § 20. Athenagoras of Athens.

1. HIS LIFE. — In the title of his Apology, whose manuscript-tradition can be traced to the year 914, Athenagoras is called the «Christian philosopher of Athens» (*Ἀθηναῖος, φιλόσοφος χριστιανός*). Very unreliable, however, are the data that an anonymous writer on the Alexandrine teachers pretends to have found in the «Christian History» of Philippus Sidetes (§ 79, 2). According to them Athenagoras presented an Apology to Hadrian and Antoninus (Pius), and was the first master of the Alexandrine catechetical school. The introduction to the Apology is a proof that it was addressed to Marcus Aurelius and Commodus, and was, therefore, composed between November 176 and March 180 — probably in 177 It is possible that the hypothesis of Zahn is correct: he identifies our Athenagoras with another of the same name to whom, after 180, Boethus of Alexandria dedicated his book «on the difficult expressions in Plato»[1].

*Harnack,* Gesch. der altchristl. Literatur, i. 256—258; ii. 1, 317—319 710. *A. Eberhard,* Athenagoras (Progr.), Augsburg, 1895.

2. HIS WORKS. — The purpose of his Apology or «Supplication» for the Christians (*πρεσβεία περὶ χριστιανῶν*, Supplicatio seu legatio pro Christianis) is to show the absurdity of the calumnies current against them, viz. atheism, Thyestean banquets, Oedipean incest (c. 3). The first accusation is very solidly refuted by a splendid exposition and demonstration of the Christian doctrine concerning God (cc. 4—30). The other two imputations are disproved by a brief *résumé* of the principles of Christian morality (cc. 32—36). It is only *en passant* that the Apology deals polemically with heathenism; otherwise in contents it closely resembles the Dialogue of Minucius Felix, though it cannot be shown that the latter made use of the work of Athenagoras. The only certain traces of its presence in ancient Christian literature are found in Methodius of Olympus[2], and in Philippus Sidetes, as described above. Still less attention was paid in antiquity to his work «On the Resurrection of the dead» (*Περὶ ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν*). In the Arethas-Codex of 914 it follows the Apology and is attributed to the same author. No other witness to this work is forthcoming; nevertheless, there is no reason to deny the assertion of the manuscript, all the more as Athenagoras himself, at the end of his Apology (c. 36, *al.* 37), promises a discussion of the doctrine of the resurrection. The work is divided into two parts. In the first the objections against the possibility of the resurrection are refuted (cc. 1—10); in the second (cc. 11—25) the author undertakes to prove the reality of the resurrection: a) from the destination of man, and of every rational creature, to be and live without end; b) from human nature, a synthesis of soul and body (cc. 14—17);

[1] *Phot.,* Bibl. Cod. 155.

[2] De resurr., i. 37, 1. (ed. *Bonwetsch*).

c) from the necessity of a retribution, not alone for the soul but for the body (cc. 18—23); d) from the last end *(τέλος)* of man, that is unattainable in this life (cc. 24—25).

All the known codices of the Apology and the treatise on the Resurrection are based on one archetype, the Arethas-Codex (§ 13). The treatise on the Resurrection was first edited by *P. Nannius* (Louvain, 1541), and the Apology by *C. Gesner* (Zürich, 1557). For the editions of both by *Morelli* and *Maranus (Gallandi, Migne)*, *de Otto* (Corpus apolog. vii.) cf. § 13. The most recent edition is that by *Ed. Schwartz,* Leipzig, 1891 (Texte und Untersuchungen, iv. 2). Both works were translated into German by *Al. Bieringer,* Kempten, 1875 (Bibl. der Kirchenväter). There is an English translation by *B. P. Pratten,* in Ante-Nicene Fathers (Am. ed. 1885), ii. 129—162. *C. J. Hefele,* Beiträge zur Kirchengesch., Archäologie und Liturgik, Tübingen, 1864, i. 60—86: «Lehre des Athenagoras und Analyse seiner Schriften.» *R. Förster,* Über die ältesten Herabilder, nebst einem Exkurs über die Glaubwürdigkeit der kunstgeschichtl. Angaben des Athenagoras (Progr.), Breslau, 1868. *L. Arnould,* De Apologia Athenagorae, Paris, 1898.

3. CHARACTERISTICS. Athenagoras is a very attractive writer. In originality of thought he yields, possibly, to his predecessors Justin and Tatian, but he far surpasses them in felicity of expression, purity and beauty of diction, simplicity and lucidity of arrangement. He is well acquainted with the Greek classics. His Apology even betrays a certain fondness for the citation of poets and philosophers. In accord with Justin, and in opposition to Tatian, he exhibits a friendly attitude toward Greek philosophy, especially Platonism. Out of the treasure of Christian doctrine he selects only such principles as seem best adapted to blunt the edge of heathen calumny. For him the witnesses and guarantors of Christian faith are the prophets, «Moses, Isaias, Jeremias, and the others» whose mouth acted as an organ of the Holy Spirit, even as the flute is the organ of the flute-player (Supplic. cc. 7 9). The rational proof of the unity of God (c. 8) merits attention, as it is the first scientific attempt of the Christians to justify their monotheism. He bears witness to the Blessed Trinity with almost startling clearness and precision (see especially c. 10).

*F Schübring,* Die Philosophie des Athenagoras (Progr.), Berlin, 1882. *A. Joannides,* Πραγματεία περὶ τῆς παρ' Ἀθηναγόρᾳ φιλοσοφικῆς γνώσεως (Dissert. inaug.), Jena, 1883. *J. Lehmann,* Die Auferstehungslehre des Athenagoras (Inaug.-Dissert.), Leipzig, 1890. *P. Logothetes,* Ἡ θεολογία τοῦ Ἀθηναγόρου (Dissert. inaug.), Leipzig, 1893. *A. Pommrich,* Des Apologeten Theophilus von Antiochien Gottes- und Logoslehre, dargestellt unter Berücksichtigung der gleichen Lehre des Athenagoras von Athen, Dresden, 1902.

### § 21. Theophilus of Antioch.

1. HIS LIFE. Theophilus is the sixth or, including St. Peter, the seventh bishop of Antioch [1]. Eusebius relates that Theophilus became

[1] *Eus.,* Chron. ad a. Abraham 2185; Hist. eccl., iv. 20. *St. Jer.,* De viris illustr., c. 25; Ep. 121, 6.

bishop of that see in 169, and his successor Maximinus in 177[1]. The latter date conflicts with the fact that the last of the three books *Ad Autolycum,* which Eusebius himself says[2] were written by Theophilus, must have been composed some little time after the death of Marcus Aurelius (March 17, 180; op. cit. cc. 27—28). Taking the contradiction for granted, it is better to assume with Harnack that the second date is erroneous than to admit with Erbes another and a later Theophilus as author of the books *Ad Autolycum.* From internal evidence it appears (i. 14) that the author had reached a mature age when he abandoned heathenism for Christianity; that his home was not far from the Euphrates and the Tigris, and that he was probably born in that neighbourhood (ii. 24); that he had received the training of an Hellene, but possessed also a certain knowledge of Hebrew (ii. 12, 24, iii. 19).

*C. Erbes,* Die Lebenszeit des Hippolytus nebst der des Theophilus von Antiochien, in Jahrbücher für prot. Theol. (1888), xiv. 611—656. *Harnack,* Gesch. der altchristl. Literatur, i. 496—502; ii. 208—213 319 ff. 534 ff.

2. THE THREE BOOKS AD AUTOLYCUM. The three books *πρὸς Αὐτόλυκον* are held together by a slender thread. If it be true that the third book was composed about 181—182, the other two may well have been written at a much earlier date. In the first book, apropos of a conversation with his heathen friend Autolycus, the author treats of the faith of Christians in an invisible God (cc. 2—11) and of the name «Christian» (c. 12). As a complement and illustration of the first book, the second discusses the folly of heathen idolatry (cc. 2—8) and offers a comprehensive view of the teachings of the prophets, «men of God and representatives of the Holy Spirit» (cc. 9—38). The third book shows the futility of the anti-Christian calumnies (Thyestean banquets and Oedipean incest, cc. 4—15), and offers proof that the Sacred Scriptures of the Christians are much older than the beginnings of Greek history and literature, older even than the mythological epoch of the Greeks (cc. 16—29). The style of Theophilus is smooth and unembarrassed, vigorous and lively; a characteristic trait is his recognition of the subjective conditions of faith and the dependence of religious knowledge on purity of mind (i. 2 ff.). He attributes an identical authority to the writings of the Evangelists (ii. 22; iii. 12), to the Epistles of St. Paul (iii. 14), and to the Prophets (ii. 9; iii. 12). He is the first to use the term *τριάς* to indicate the distinction of persons in the Godhead (ii. 15)

The books *Ad Autolycum* have come down to us in the eleventh-century Codex Marcianus 496, and of others that depend upon it. *J. Frisius (C. Gesner)* published the *editio princeps,* Zürich, 1546; for later editions see § 13. The most recent is that of *de Otto,* Corp. apolog., viii. A German

[1] Chron. ad a. Abraham 2185 2193. [2] Hist. eccl., iv. 24.

version was made by *J. Leitl* (Bibl. der Kirchenväter), Kempten, 1873. There is an English translation by *M. Dods*, in Ante-Nicene Fathers (Am. ed. 1885), ii. 89—121. For the concept of faith in this work of Theophilus cf. *L. Paul*, in Jahrbücher für prot. Theol. (1875), i. 546—559. The evidence of Theophilus to the Canon of the New Testament is treated by *Harnack*, in Zeitschr. für Kirchengesch. (1889—1890), xi. 1—21. For his teaching concerning God cf. *G. Karabangeles*, Leipzig, 1891 (Dissert. inaug.), and *O. Gross*, Chemnitz, 1896 (Progr.). *A. Pommrich*, Des Apologeten Theophilus von Antiochien Gottes- und Logoslehre, etc., Dresden, 1902. *O. Clausen*, Die Theologie des Theophilus von Antiochien, in Zeitschr. für wissenschaftl. Theol. (1902), xlv. 81—141; (1903), xlvi. 195—213.

3. LOST WRITINGS. Theophilus often refers to a previous work of his, the first book of which was entitled *περὶ ἱστοριῶν*; it dealt with the earliest history of mankind (ii. 30). The citations of John Malalas (ed. *Dindorf* 29, *al.* 59) from a «Theophilus chronographer» are very probably not from this work. — Eusebius mentions[1] a work of Theophilus, Against the heresy of Hermogenes *(πρὸς τὴν αἵρεσιν Ἑρμογένους)*, some catechetical writings *(τινὰ κατηχητικὰ βιβλία)* mentioned also by St. Jerome[2], and a work against Marcion *(κατὰ Μαρκίωνος)*. St. Jerome mentions also (ibid.) two works current under the name of Theophilus: Commentaries on the Gospel[3], and on the Proverbs of Solomon (in Evangelium et in Proverbia Salomonis commentarii). De la Bigne published (1575) under the name of Theophilus a Latin Commentary on the Gospels, an unorderly collection of allegorical scholia on excerpts from the four Gospels. It ought not to be identified, as is done by Zahn, with the Commentary described by St. Jerome, nor should it be attributed to Theophilus. It is rather, what Harnack has proved it to be, a compilation from Cyprian, Jerome, Ambrose, the pseudo-Arnobius Junior, and Augustine, put together by a Latin compiler, probably in Southern Gaul, and toward the end of the fifth century. In three ancient manuscripts, unknown to Zahn, there is a prologue to the work in which the anonymous author says that his labours are an anthology from earlier expositors (tractatoribus defloratis opusculum spiritale composui).

Editions of the pseudo-Theophilus-commentary on the Gospels are found in *De la Bigne*, Bibl. SS. Patrum, Paris, 1575, v. 169—192; *de Otto*, Corpus apolog., viii. 278—326; *Zahn*, Forschungen zur Gesch. des neutestamentl. Kanons (1883), ii. 29—85. For the three codices discovered since that date cf. *Harnack*, in Texte und Untersuchungen (1883), i. 4, 159—175; *Pitra*, Analecta Sacra (1884), ii. 624—634, 649—650; *Zahn* l. c., ii. (Der Evangelienkommentar des Theophilus von Antiochien), also (1884), iii. 198—277; *Harnack* l. c., pp. 97—176 (Der angebliche Evangelienkommentar des Theophilus von Antiochien), and Theol. Literaturzeitung, 1886, pp. 404 f. *A. Hauck*, in Zeitschrift für kirchl. Wissenschaft und kirchl.

[1] Hist. eccl., iv. 24.

[2] De viris illustr., c. 25: breves elegantesque tractatus ad aedificationem ecclesiae pertinentes.

[3] Cf. also Ep. 121, 6; Comm. in Matth., praef.

Leben (1884), v. 561—568; *W. Sanday,* in Studia Biblica, Oxford, 1885, pp. 89—101; *W. Bornemann,* in Zeitschr. für Kirchengesch. (1888—1889), x. 169—252, also took part in the controversy.

### § 22. The Letter to Diognetus.

Under the name of Justin Martyr there has been handed down in a codex of the thirteenth or fourteenth century a Letter to Diognetus *(πρὸς Διόγνητον)*, which purposes to reply to certain questions asked by a heathen much interested in Christianity These questions deal with the specific nature of the Christian adoration of God in contradistinction to the pagan and the Jewish worship, the surprising change of life and the remarkable love for their neighbour that the Christians exhibit. It is further asked why this new religion should have appeared now, and not at an earlier period. The replies to these questions are distinguished for elevation of tone, profound grasp of the Christian ideas, magnificence and splendour of exposition. The portrait of the daily life of the Christians is positively fascinating (cc. 5—6). The theme is exhausted in the tenth chapter; what is read in cc. 11—12 of the codex does not belong to the original Letter. Nor does the codex deserve credence as to the author of the document, whose fine classical diction is quite irreconcilable with the unstudied, unornamented and unimpassioned style of Justin. Regarding the letter we have no information from extrinsic sources. Donaldson attempted to show that it was an academic exercise in style or declamation, belonging to the fifteenth or sixteenth century. But the date of the codex suffices to discredit this hypothesis. Internal evidence would show that the work belongs to the era of the persecutions (cc. 5 7). It does not belong, therefore, to the post-Constantinian period, as Overbeck asserts, but rather to the second or third century In the absence of more positive evidence it is difficult to assign a more precise date, though the earlier one seems preferable. In this case the recipient of the Letter might have been Diognetus, the well-known preceptor of Marcus Aurelius. The authorship has been variously attributed; by Bunsen to Marcion, by Dräseke to Apelles, the disciple of Marcion, by Doulcet, Kihn, and Krüger to Aristides of Athens. The latter hypothesis alone merits attention. There is an undeniable relationship between the two documents; but something more is needed to render probable an identity of authorship or even a contemporaneous composition of both works.

The Letter to Diognetus reached us in only one manuscript, the Codex Argentoratensis 9 (§ 17, 2). It was destroyed by the fire of Strasburg in the siege of 1870. The *editio princeps* is that of *H. Stephanus,* Paris, 1592. Later it was printed among the works of Justin (§ 17, 2) by *de Otto,* Corpus apolog. (1879), iii. 158—211, and more recently among the works of the Apostolic Fathers by *von Gebhardt* and *Harnack,* Barnabae epist. (1878),

pp. 142—164, and by *Funk*, Opera Patr. apostol. (1878, 1887, 1901), i. 310—333. The latter editor was the first to make use (1901) of an ancient copy of Codex Argentoratensis 9, preserved at Tübingen. The Letter has been often translated into modern languages. We are indebted for a new German rendering to *W. Heinzelmann*, Erfurt, 1896. There is an English translation by *Roberts* and *Donaldson*, in Ante-Nicene Fathers (Am. ed. 1885), i. 25—30. Cf. *J. Donaldson*, A Critical History of Christian Literature and Doctrine, London, 1866, ii. 126—142. *Fr Overbeck*, Über den pseudo-justinischen Brief an Diognet (Progr.), Basel, 1872, reprinted with additions in the same author's Studien zur Gesch. der alten Kirche, Schloß Chemnitz, 1875, i. 1—92. *J. Dräseke*, Der Brief an Diognetos, Leipzig, 1881, a reprint from Jahrbücher für prot. Theol. (1881), vii. *H. Kihn*, Der Ursprung des Briefes an Diognet, Freiburg, 1882. *G. Krüger* defended, in Zeitschr. für wissenschaftl. Theol. (1894), xxxvii. 206—223, the authorship of Aristides, but later he abandoned this opinion of *Kihn*. in his Gesch. der altchristl. Literatur, appendices, Freiburg, 1897. For the relations between the Letter and the Apology of Aristides cf. *R. Seeberg*, in *Zahn*, Forschungen zur Gesch. des neutestamentl. Kanons (1893), v. 239—243. *Kihn*, Zum Briefe an Diognet, in Theol. Quartalschr. (1902), lxxxiv. 495—498. *G. N. Bonwetsch* has shown that cc. 1—12 of the Letter to Diognetus belong to Hippolytus. *F. X. Funk*, Das Schlußkapitel des Diognetenbriefes, in Theol. Quartalschr. (1903), lxxxv. 638—639.

### § 23. Hermias.

Under the title, «A Mockery of Heathen Philosophers by the Philosopher Hermias» (*Ἑρμείου φιλοσόφου διασυρμὸς τῶν ἔξω φιλοσόφων, Irrisio gentilium philosophorum*), a small work has come down that sets forth, in a satirical way, the contradictory opinions of Greek philosophers concerning the human soul (cc. 1—2) and the fundamental principles of the universe (cc. 3—10). The author exhibits wit and ability, but is superficial, inasmuch as he constantly fails to seize or to realize the respective cohesion of the theses of the philosophers. This work is never mentioned in Christian antiquity, and in the text itself there are no clear traces of its actual date. However, the author does not belong, as Diels thinks, to the fifth or sixth century, but rather to the second or third. Hermias bears the title of «philosopher» in common with several apologists of the second and third centuries: Aristides, Justin, Athenagoras, and the pseudo-Melito. The attitude and tendency of his work, its polemical bitterness and lively diction, point, apparently, to the period of the earliest intellectual conflict of youthful Christianity with Hellenic philosophy. Certain indications that the writer made use of the *Cohortatio ad Gentiles* of the pseudo-Justin[1], do not justify the opinion that the work was of a later date than we have indicated.

For the manuscript-tradition cf. *Harnack*, Gesch. der altchristl. Literatur, i. 782 f. The *editio princeps* is that of *J. Oporinus*, Basel, 1553.

[1] Compare respectively Irris., cc. 1 5, with Cohort., cc. 7 31. In the latter passages, however, it seems better to admit the use, by both writers, of a third source: i. e. *Pseudo-Plut.*, De placitis phil., i. 7, 4.

Other editions are those of *Morelli* and *Maranus (Gallandi, Migne), v. Otto,* Corpus apolog., ix. 1—31; cf. xl.—li. and § 13. The most recent edition is that of *H. Diels,* Doxographi Graeci, Berlin, 1879, pp. 649—656, cf. pp. 259 to 263. A German version by *J. Leitl* is found in the Bibl. der Kirchenväter, Kempten, 1873.

### § 24. Minucius Felix.

1. THE DIALOGUE «OCTAVIUS». This Latin apology for Christianity is in every way worthy to rank with the preceding Greek works of the same nature. It is thrown into the form of a Dialogue between the Christian Octavius Januarius and the heathen Caecilius Natalis, both friends of the author Minucius Felix, a Roman lawyer *(causidicus).* It opens in a very lively manner: the disputants are seated by the sea at Ostia, having chosen Minucius Felix as arbiter of their controversy (cc. 1—4). Caecilius advocates the teaching of the Skeptics, yet defends the faith of his fathers as the one source of Roman greatness; Christianity is an unreasonable and immoral illusion (cc. 5—13). Octavius follows closely the arguments of Caecilius, makes a drastic exposé of the follies of polytheism, and refutes the usual anti-Christian calumnies (adoration of the head of an ass, of the genitalia of the clergy, Thyestean banquets, Oedipean incest, atheism) and closes with a touching portrait of the faith and life of the Christians (cc. 16—38). No arbiter's judgment is needed, as Cæcilius admits his defeat. For artistic composition and graceful treatment of the given theme none of the second or third century Christian apologies can be compared to the «Octavius» The *De natura deorum* of Cicero was apparently the author's model. He certainly made use of this work of Cicero and of his *De divinatione,* likewise of the *De providentia* and *De superstitione* of Seneca. A generous humanitarian tone pervades the entire work. The monotheistic character of Christianity is constantly insisted on (c. 18). Its most important feature is the practical morality it inculcates (c. 32, 3). The author does not mention the Christian mysteries, nor does he make use of the Sacred Scriptures (cf. however c. 34, 5). At the same time we cannot admit with Kühn that Minucius furnishes no more than «an ethnico-philosophical concept of Christianity». His work is an exposition of the genuine Christian truth, but executed in a manner suitable to impress the philosophical circles of heathenism.

The Dialogue has reached us only through Codex Parisinus 1661 of the ninth century (and a copy of the sixteenth century), in which it appears as the eighth book of Arnobius' *Adversus nationes.* The first editors were *F. Sabaeus,* Rome, 1543, and *Fr. Balduin,* Heidelberg, 1560. Later it was edited or reprinted by *C. de Muralt,* Zürich, 1836; *Migne,* PL., iii. (Paris, 1844); *J. B. Kayser,* Paderborn, 1863; *C. Halm,* Vienna, 1867 (Corpus script. eccles. lat., ii.); *J. J. Cornelissen,* Leyden, 1882; *E. Bährens,* Leipzig, 1886. The best of these editions is that by Halm. It is reprinted

in Bibliotheca Ss. Patrum, Rome, 1901. For new contributions to the textual criticism of «Octavius» cf. *Teuffel-Schwabe,* Gesch. der römischen Literatur, 5. ed., pp. 931 1317, and *J. Vahlen,* in Index lect. Berol. per sem. aest. a (1894), also in Hermes (1895), xxx. 385—390. *C. Synnerberg,* Randbemerkungen zu Minucius Felix, Berlin, 1897. Translations into German have been made by *A. Bieringer,* Kempten, 1871 (Bibliothek der Kirchenväter); *B. Dombart,* Erlangen, 1875—1876; 2. ed. (text of *Halm*), 1881; *H. Hagen,* Berne, 1890. There is an English translation by *R. E. Wallis,* in Ante-Nicene Fathers (Am. ed. 1885), iv. 173—198. *E. Behr,* Der Octavius des M. Minucius Felix in seinem Verhältnis zu Ciceros Büchern *De natura deorum* (Dissert. inaug.), Gera, 1870. Concerning the models and «fontes» of the Dialogue cf. *Th. Keim,* Celsus' Wahres Wort, Zürich, 1873, pp. 151—168; *G. Lösche,* in Jahrb. für prot. Theol. (1882), viii. 168—178; *P. de Félice,* Étude sur l'Octavius de Minucius Félix (Thèse), Blois, 1880. *R. Kühn,* Der Octavius des Minucius Felix, eine heidnisch-philosophische Auffassung vom Christentum, Leipzig, 1882. Against *Kühn* cf. *O. Grillnberger,* in Jahrb. für Philos. u. spekul. Theol. (1889), iii. 104—118, 146—161, 260—269; *B. Seiller,* De sermone Minuciano (Progr.), Vienna, 1893. There is an exhaustive bibliography of «Octavius» in *J. P. Waltzing,* Bibliographie raisonnée de Minucius Félix, in Muséon belge (1902), vi. 216—261. Minucius Felix, Octavius, in usum lectionum suarum, ed. *J. P. Waltzing,* Louvain, 1903. Octavius, rec. et praefatus est *H. Boenig,* Leipzig, 1903. Cf. *O. Bollero,* «L'Octavius» de M. Minucio Felice e le sue relazioni con la coltura classica, in Rivista filosofica, 1903; *C. Synnerberg,* Randbemerkungen zu Minucius Felix, Helsingfors-Berlin, 1903, ii; *G. Bossier,* L'Octavius de Minucius Félix, in La fin du paganisme, 3. ed., Paris, 1898, i. 261—289; *F. X. Burger,* Über das Verhältnis des Minucius Felix zu dem Philosophen Seneca (Dissert.), München, 1904; *G. Thiancourt,* Les premiers apologistes chrétiens à Rome et les traités philosophiques de Cicéron, Paris, 1904.

2. AUTHORSHIP AND DATE. We know no more of the events of the author's life. He tells us himself (cc. 1—4) that in his later years only had he come forth «from deepest obscurity into the light of wisdom and truth». Lactantius[1] seems to suppose that Minucius preceded Tertullian; Jerome[2], on the contrary, is surely of the opinion that Tertullian wrote previously to Minucius. There is indeed a close resemblance between the «Octavius» and the «Apologeticum» of Tertullian, written in 197. We believe with Ebert, Schwenke, Reck, and others that it is Tertullian who made use of Minucius, and not, as earlier writers (and recently Massebieau) have held, Minucius who used the writings of Tertullian. Still less tenable is the theory of Hartel and Wilhelm that we must suppose a third source common to both, but no longer discoverable. There are other evidences of the priority of Minucius. Fronto of Cirta, who died after 175, must have been alive, or at least a very well-known personality, at the time of the composition of «Octavius» (cc. 9, 6; 31, 2). A reliable *terminus ad quem* is the tractate of Cyprian *Quod idola dii non sint,* written perhaps in 248, and in which the work of Minucius is copiously drawn

[1] Div. inst., v. 1, 22; cf. i. 11, 55.
[2] De viris illustr., cc. 53, 58; Ep. 70, 5.

upon. The «Octavius» may have been written at the beginning of the reign of Commodus (180—192). There is no reason for admitting with de Félice and Schanz, an earlier date, e. g. the reign of Antoninus Pius. On the other hand, Neumann is quite arbitrary when he brings down the date of composition to the reign of Philippus Arabs (244—249); still more so is Schultze when he attributes it to the beginning of the fourth century The use of the work by Cyprian is sufficient to exclude both of these hypotheses.

For the date of composition cf. *A. Ebert,* in Abhandlungen der phil.-hist. Klasse der kgl. sächs. Gesellsch. der Wissensch. (1870), v. 319—420; *W Hartel,* in Zeitschr. für die österreich. Gymnasien (1869), xx. 348—368; *V Schultze,* in Jahrb. für prot. Theol. (1881), vii. 485—506; *P. Schwenke,* ib. (1883), ix. 263—294; *F. X. Reck,* in Theol. Quartalschr. (1886), lxviii. 64—114; *Fr. Wilhelm,* in Breslauer philolog. Abhandlungen (1887), ii. 1; *M. L. Massebieau,* in Revue de l'hist. des religions (1887), xv. 316—346; *K. J. Neumann,* Der römische Staat und die allgemeine Kirche, Leipzig, 1890, i. 241 ff. 250 ff.; *M. Schanz,* in Rhein. Museum für Philol., new series (1895), L. 114—136; *E. Norden,* in Index lect. Gryphiswald. per sem. aest. a. 1897; *H. Boenig,* in a programme of the Gymnasium of Königsberg, 1897.

3. THE TREATISE «DE FATO». Jerome was acquainted with a work current under the name of Minucius, entitled *De fato vel contra mathematicos.* He doubted its authenticity because of the diversity of style [1]. It is true that in the «Octavius» Minucius does promise (c. 36, 2) a work *De fato.* Possibly his own words caused an homonymous work of some other writer to be fathered upon him.

## THIRD SECTION.

## THE HERETICAL LITERATURE OF THE SECOND CENTURY AND THE NEW TESTAMENT APOCRYPHA.

### § 25. Gnostic Literature.

1. INTRODUCTION. The apologetic literature was one result of the conflict between heathenism and Christianity. But even while the Apostles lived, the Church came in contact with another formidable enemy known as heresy. It did not dispute with her the right to exist, but it threatened the purity and integrity of her apostolic faith. It is of importance, therefore, that a brief summary of the literary labours of heretics should precede an account of the anti-heretical literature.

The most influential of the primitive heresies was Gnosticism. It aimed at undermining the entire structure of Christian faith, since, in spite of the contradictions of its multiform systems, it was based on the hypothesis of a dual principle and rejected the doctrine of creation. Nevertheless, it made much headway in the East and West,

[1] Ib.

especially among the cultured classes, and brought forth a literature of more than ordinary variety and richness. With the exception of a few works preserved, for the most part, in Coptic, this literature has perished, and is known to us only from the few fragments that the ecclesiastical writers inserted in their polemical writings for the purpose of confuting their heretical opponents.

The principal authorities for the study of Gnosticism and its literature are the *Adversus haereses* of *Irenaeus*, the *Philosophumena* of *Hippolytus*, the *Panarion* or *Haereses* of *Epiphanius*, and the *Liber de haeresibus* of *Philastrius*. For critical researches on the sources of these and similar works cf. *R. A. Lipsius*, Zur Quellenkritik des Epiphanios, Vienna, 1865; Die Quellen der ältesten Ketzergeschichte neu untersucht, Leipzig, 1875. *Ad. Harnack*, Zur Quellenkritik der Geschichte des Gnostizismus, Leipzig, 1873; Zur Quellenkritik der Gesch. des Gnostizismus, in Zeitschr. für die histor. Theol. (1874), xliv. 143—226. *A. Hilgenfeld*, Die Ketzergeschichte des Urchristentums urkundlich dargestellt, Leipzig, 1884; Judentum und Judenchristentum, Leipzig, 1886. *J. Kunze*, De historiae gnosticismi fontibus novae quaestiones criticae, Leipzig, 1894. Collections of Gnostic fragments are found in *J. E. Grabe*, Spicilegium Ss. Patrum ut et haereticorum saec. p. Chr. n. i. ii. et iii., Oxford, 1698—1699; 2. ed. 1714, 2 voll., passim; in *R. Massuet's* edition of the *Adversus haereses* of Irenaeus, Paris, 1710, pp. 349—376 (*Migne*, PG., vii. 1263—1322); in *A. Stieren's* edition of Irenaeus, Leipzig, 1848—1853, i. 899—971; in *Hilgenfeld*, Die Ketzergeschichte des Urchristentums, passim. For the most complete index of Gnostic writers and writings cf. *Ad. Harnack*, Gesch. der altchristl. Literatur, i. 143—205; ii. 1, 289—311, 533—541; *R. Liechtenhahn*, Untersuchungen zur koptisch-gnostischen Literatur, in Zeitschr. für wissenschaftl. Theol. (1901), xliv 236—252; *Id.*, On the apocryphal literature of the Gnostics, in Zeitschr. für neutestamentl. Wissensch. (1902), iii. 222—237; *E. de Faye*, Introduction à l'étude du gnosticisme au 2e et 3e siècle, in Revue de l'histoire des religions (1902), and Paris, 1903.

2. BASILIDES AND ISIDORUS. It would seem that the earliest chiefs of the Gnostic sects, Dositheus, Simon Magus, Cleobius, Menander, Cerinthus, Nicolaus (?), Satornilus, left no writings, though at an early date certain works were attributed to them by their followers. Origen[1] is aware of pretended «books of Dositheus»; Hippolytus[2] bases his account of the teachings of Simon Magus on a supposed «Great revelation» *(ἀπόφασις μεγάλη)* current, we may suppose, under the name of Simon. Other ecclesiastical writers were of the same view. Basilides, who taught at Alexandria about 120—140, wrote a Gospel, a Commentary on the same, also Psalms or Canticles (Odes). His Gospel is often mentioned by name[3], first by Origen, but not analysed or described. It was probably no more than a compilation made for his own purposes from the four Gospels. According to Agrippa Castor the Commentary of Basilides consisted of twenty-four books[4]. Some fragments of it are quoted by Clement of Alexandria,

[1] Comm. in Joan. xiii. 27: *βίβλους τοῦ Δοσιθέου.* [2] Philos., vi. 7—20; al.
[3] *Orig.*, Hom. 1 in Lucam. [4] *Eus.*, Hist. eccl., iv. 7, 7.

Origen, and the author of the *Acta Archelai et Manetis*. Concerning the Psalms or Odes we merely know the fact that they once existed[1]. The nature of teachings of Basilides is variously represented by ancient writers, the Basilides of Irenæus[2] seems to be a dualist and an emanationist, while, according to Hippolytus[3], he seems to be an evolutionist and a pantheist. In order to reconcile these descriptions of the Basilidian system it is customary to admit two phases of the same: a primitive form and a later transformation. It still remains doubtful whether the prior stage of the heresy were that set forth by Irenæus or the one described by Hippolytus. Salmon and Stähelin have recently maintained that, in his account of Basilides, Hippolytus was deceived, as he was on other occasions (§ 54, 3), by Gnostic forgeries, but this hypothesis offers too violent a solution of the problem. Isidore, «legitimate son and disciple» of Basilides[4], left at least three works. Their titles, according to Clement of Alexandria, were: On an adherent soul[5] (*περὶ προσφυοῦς ψυχῆς*; Isidore distinguished between a rational and an «appended» soul); Ethica (*ἠθικά*)[6], perhaps identical with the *παραινετικά* that Epiphanius attributes to him[7], and an Exposition of the prophet Parchor[8] (*ἐξηγητικὰ τοῦ προφήτου Παρχώρ*). Parchor was one of the prophets invented by Basilides and invoked as authorities. Agrippa Castor (l. c.) says that he deliberately chose barbarian names for them.

The fragments of the works of Basilides and Isidore are collected in *Grabe* (see p. 73, Oxford, 1699), ii. 35—43, 64—68; *Massuet* (see p. 73) pp. 349 ff., 351 ff.; *Stieren* l. c., pp. 901 ff., 907 ff.; *Hilgenfeld* l. c., pp. 207 ff.; 213 ff. They have received special attention from the latter and from *Th. Zahn*, Gesch. des neutestamentl. Kanons (1888—1889), i. 763—774. *J. Kennedy*, Buddhist Gnosticism. The System of Basilides, London, 1902. Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society.

3. THE OPHITES OR «GNOSTICS». The Ophites, or «Brethren of the Serpent», were the first to take the name of Gnostics (*γνωστικοί*). Even in the second century they had branched out quite extensively. Some were frankly antinomian in their principles, committed the gravest excesses, and indulged in abominable orgies, while others embraced, theoretically at least, Encratite doctrines. The ancient heresiologists are unanimous in declaring that several of these sects had themselves composed, or used and esteemed highly, very many works, chiefly apocryphal, but current under the name of biblical characters. St. Irenæus made use of several such writings for his account of ancient heresies; but he mentions the name of only one — the Gospel of Judas, a book of the Cainites[9] Hippolytus is wont to indicate more

[1] Fragm. Murat., c. fin.; *Orig.* in Job xxi. 11 sq.
[2] Adv. haer., i. 24, 3—7, etc. [3] Philos., vii. 20—27; al.
[4] Ib., vii. 20. [5] *Clem. Al.*, Strom., ii. 20, 113. [6] Ib., iii. 1, 2.
[7] Haer., 32, 3. [8] *Clem. Al.* l. c., vi. 6, 53.
[9] Adv. haer., i. 31, 1.

particularly the sources of his narrative, and Epiphanius has preserved the titles of a long series of Ophitic writings. In recent times some Ophitic works of Encratite tendencies have been discovered in Coptic translations. The *Pistis Sophia,* edited in 1851 by Schwartze and Petermann from a fifth or sixth century Coptic codex (Askewianus) in the British Museum, is a specimen of such heretical literature. It relates, in the form of a conversation between the risen Saviour and his male and female disciples, among whom Mary Magdalen is prominent, the fall and the redemption of *Pistis Sophia,* a being from the world of the Æons. The vicissitudes of her story prefigure the way of purification for mankind through penance. Numerous psalms (odes) are scattered through the text; apart from five «Solomonic» psalms, that are placed on a level with the psalms of David, they seem to be the work of the author. In its present form the *Pistis Sophia* is made up of four books, and was very probably put together in the second half of the third century, in Egypt. It was formerly erroneously attributed to Valentine (see p. 76) or to some later member of his school. At present the first three books are by many identified with the «Little Questions of Mary» *(ἐρωτήσεις Μαρίας μικραί)* that Epiphanius quotes [1] as a book of the «Gnostics»; the fourth book is apparently of an earlier date. A Coptic papyrus-codex of Oxford (Brucianus), belonging to the fifth or sixth century, has saved from loss two Ophite works. Their content was made known in 1891 by Amélineau, and in 1892 by Schmidt. In the larger one our Lord expounds to his male and female disciple certain cosmogonic speculations and gives them theologico-practical instructions. In the smaller one he illustrates the origin and evolution of the world. The text of both codices, however, is disfigured by gaps and breaks. According to Schmidt, the larger codex was written among the Severians [2], about the middle of the third century, and is identical with the two «Books of Jeû» cited in *Pistis Sophia* [3]. The smaller one appears to be of very remote antiquity, and is held by Schmidt to be a book of the Sethians or Archontici [4] written about the middle of the second century His arguments, however, are open to objections. — A Coptic papyrus of the fifth (?) century, acquired in 1896 for the Egyptian Museum in Berlin, includes three fragments of Gnostic origin. They are, according to the provisory description of Schmidt: a «Gospel according to Mary» (*εὐαγγέλιον κατὰ Μαριάμ*, with the subtitle: *ἀπόκρυφον Ἰωάννου,* containing mostly revelations to John); a «Wisdom of Jesus Christ» (*σοφία Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*, revelations of our Lord after His death), and an «Act of Peter» (*πρᾶξις Πέτρου,* a miraculous healing of Peter's own daughter). St. Irenæus seems

[1] Haer., 26, 8. [2] *Epiph.,* Haer., 45.
[3] Ed. *Schwartze* and *Petermann,* p. 245 sq., 354.
[4] *Epiph.,* l. c., 39—40.

to have known and used the «Gospel according to Mary», in his description of the Barbelo-Gnostics[1]; a clearer knowledge will be possible only when the text is published.

*Pistis Sophia.* Opus gnosticum Valentino adiudicatum e codice manuscripto Coptico Londinensi descripsit et latine vertit *M. G. Schwartze.* Edidit *J. H. Petermann,* Berlin, 1851. *K. R. Köstlin,* Das gnostische System des Buches *Pistis Sophia,* in Theol. Jahrbücher (1854), xiii. 1—104, 137—196. *Ad. Harnack,* Über das gnostische Buch *Pistis Sophia,* in Texte und Untersuchungen (1891), vii. 2, 1—114. Cf. also the writings of Schmidt (mentioned below) on the *Papyrus Brucianus.* The edition and translation of this codex by *Amélineau* (Paris, 1891) was not a success; the same may be said of his Comptes-rendus concerning the contents of the codex. *É. Andersson,* Compte-rendu critique: Amélineau. Πίστις Σοφία, ouvrage gnostique de Valentin, traduit du copte en français, in Sphinx, 1904, pp. 237—253.

The *editio princeps* is, we may remark, that of *C. Schmidt,* Gnostische Schriften in koptischer Sprache, aus dem codex Brucianus herausgegeben, übersetzt und bearbeitet (Texte und Untersuchungen, viii. 1—2), Leipzig, 1892. Cf. *Schmidt,* in Zeitschr. für wissenschaftl. Theol. (1894), xxxvii. 555—585.

For the Berlin papyrus cf. *C. Schmidt,* Ein vorirenäisches gnostisches Originalwerk in koptischer Sprache, in Sitzungsberichte der kgl. preuß. Akad. der Wissensch., Berlin, 1896, pp. 839—847.

*C. Schmidt,* Koptisch-gnostische Schriften: I. Die Pistis Sophia; II. Die beiden Bücher des Jeû; III. Unbekanntes altgnostisches Werk, Berlin, 1905. (Griechisch-christliche Schriftsteller.) For an English translation of *Pistis Sophia,* made from the German of *C. Schmidt,* see *E. R. S. Mead,* Fragments of a Faith Forgotten, London and Benares, 1900, pp. 459—479; cf. ib. pp. 605—630, a full bibliography of works on Gnosticism.

4. CARPOCRATIANS. — The followers of Carpocrates of Alexandria[2] consigned to various works their peculiar «Gnosis» which was closely related to that of the antinomian group of the Ophites. Clement of Alexandria furnishes some particulars concerning one of these works[3]. He tells us that about the middle of the second century Epiphanes, son of Carpocrates, though only seventeen years of age, wrote a work «On justice» *(περὶ δικαιοσύνης)* in which, as is evident from the citations of Clement, he advocated a thorough communism, even of women.

*U. Benigni,* I socialisti alessandrini del II. secolo, in Bessarione (1896 to 1897), i. 597—601.

5. VALENTINE AND VALENTINIANS. — Valentine is held to be the most intellectual champion of the hellenizing Gnosis, which followed in the footsteps of Plato and taught a parallelism between the ideal world above *(πλήρωμα)* and the lower world of phenomena *(κένωμα, ὑστέρημα).* The connecting link is the *κάτω σοφία* or Achamoth, a being fallen from the *ἄνω σοφία*, last of the Æons, into the visible world. At the moment of his baptism the Æon Soter (or Jesus) descended upon the Christ who had been promised and sent by the Demiurge or World-Creator. Valentine was an Egyptian and had been

[1] Adv. haer., i. 29. [2] Ib., i. 25, 4 5. [3] Strom., iii. 2, 5—9.

initiated into Greek science at Alexandria. From 135 to 160 (approximately) he sojourned at Rome, and there took place his final apostasy from the Church. Wounded in his pride at being an unsuccessful candidate for the papacy, in revenge he took up the role of an archheretic. The date of his death is uncertain. Clement of Alexandria has preserved some fragments of his Letters and Homilies[1]. Hippolytus[2] has saved a remnant of the Psalms of Valentine[3]. The *Sophia Valentini* in Tertullian[4] is not a work of this Gnostic, but rather his Æon Sophia. According to Irenæus, the Valentinians made use of a «Gospel of Truth», which had nothing in common with the canonical Gospels[5] — During his life, apparently, the school of Valentine divided into two branches: known respectively as the Italian or Western and the Eastern branch. The *Italici* declared the body of the Saviour to be of a psychic character, while the Easterns maintained that is was pneumatic. The principal writers of the Italian school were Heracleon and Ptolemy, both personal disciples of Valentine. Heracleon composed a Commentary on St. John, from which Origen, in his Commentary on that evangelist, has taken about fifty citations, partly verbal and partly paraphrased. Two other exegetical passages of Heracleon are cited by Clement of Alexandria[6]. As a rule the exegesis of Heracleon is not only very arbitrary, but also absurd. Some extracts from Ptolemy are found in Irenæus[7], including an exposition of the prologue of the Gospel of John. We owe to Epiphanius[8] the preservation of the complete text of a Letter of Ptolemy to Flora, a Christian lady, in which he undertakes to prove that the Law of the Old Testament was the work not of the Supreme God, but of the World-Creator or Demiurge. The Syriac fragment of a Letter of St. Irenæus to Pope Victor exhibits a certain Florinus, at one time a priest of the Roman Church, in the character of a Christian writer (cf. § 34, 4). The chief literary remains of the Eastern branch of the Valentinians are the *Excerpta ex scriptis Theodoti: ἐκ τῶν Θεοδότου καὶ τῆς ἀνατολικῆς καλουμένης διδασκαλίας κατὰ τοὺς Οὐαλεντίνου χρόνους ἐπιτομαί.* They have come down under the name of Clement of Alexandria, and are an account of the teachings of the Oriental Valentinians, together with excerpts from the writings of an otherwise unknown Theodotus and some anonymous Valentinians.

The fragments of the writings of Valentine may be seen in *Grabe* l. c., ii. 43—58; *Massuet* l. c., pp. 352—355; *Stieren* l. c., pp. 909—916;

[1] Strom., ii. 8, 36; iv. 13, 89 ff.; al. [2] Philos., vi. 37.
[3] *Tert.*, De carne Christi, c. 17, 20; al. [4] Adv. Valent., c. 2.
[5] Veritatis evangelium, in nihilo conveniens apostolorum evangeliis: Adv. haer., iii. 11, 9.
[6] Strom., iv. 9, 70 ff.; Eclog. proph., c. 25. [7] Adv. haer., i. 1—8, 5.
[8] Haer., 33, 5—7

*Hilgenfeld* l. c., pp. 292—307. The fragments of Heracleon are in *Grabe,* pp. 80—117, 236; *Massuet,* pp. 362—376; *Stieren,* pp. 936—971; *Hilgenfeld,* pp. 472—505; cf. *A. E. Brooke,* The Fragments of Heracleon (Texts and Studies, i. 4), Cambridge, 1891. On Heracleon see *G. Salmon,* in Dict. of Christian Biography, London, 1880, ii. 897—900. The Letter of Ptolemy to Flora is in *Grabe,* pp. 68—80; *Massuet,* pp. 357—361; *Stieren,* pp. 922—936; *Hilgenfeld,* in Zeitschr. für wissenschaftl. Theol. (1881), xxiv. 214—230; cf. *Hilgenfeld,* Die Ketzergesch. des Urchristentums, p. 346, note 580. An unsuccessful attempt was made by Stieren to disprove the authenticity and the unity of the Letter of Ptolemy to Flora. *A. Stieren,* De Ptolemaei Valentiniani ad Floram epistola, Part. I, Jenae, 1843. Cf. *Ad. Harnack,* Der Brief des Ptolemäus an die Flora. Eine relig. Kritik am Pentateuch im 2. Jahrhundert, in Sitzungsberichte der kgl. preuß. Akad. der Wissensch., Berlin, 1902, pp. 507—545. *G. Heinrici,* Die valentinianische Gnosis und die Heilige Schrift, Berlin, 1871; *Zahn,* Gesch. des neutestamentl. Kanons, i. 718—763: «Der Schriftgebrauch in der Schule Valentins»; cf. ii. 953—961; *F. Torm,* Valentinianismen, historie og laere, Copenhagen, 1901; *G. Mercati,* Note di litteratura biblica e cristiana antica (Studi e Testi, Rome, 1901), v. 88 sq. In this work is cited from a certain Anthimus a passage of an otherwise unknown work of Valentine (*περὶ τῶν τριῶν φύσεων*).

6. BARDESANES AND HARMONIUS. According to Oriental writers the Syrian Bardesanes (Bar Daisan) was born of noble parents at Edessa, July 11., 154, proclaimed himself founder of a new religion 180—190, fled to Armenia in 216 or 217, after the conquest of Edessa by Caracalla, returned later to his native land and died there 222—223. He was originally a Valentinian of the Eastern type, but soon developed a religious system of his own that is rightly looked on as a foreshadowing of Manichæism. Certain hymns of Ephraem Syrus show that Bardesanes devoted himself particularly to astrological and cosmogonic speculations[1], and that he maintained against Marcion (see p. 79) the unity of God; while at the same time he introduced a plurality of gods. His son Harmonius, according to Sozomen[2], added to the teachings of his father the opinions of Greek philosophers concerning the soul, the origin and end of the body, and the second birth. Ephraem Syrus relates[3] that Bardesanes wrote 150 Psalms and composed the melodies for the same, but Sozomen (l. c.) says that Harmonius was the parent of Syriac hymnology Probably the latter collected and edited his father's poetical works, and added thereto something of his own. It is possible that some fragments of the Psalms of Bardesanes are yet to be seen in the poetical remnants of the apocryphal «Acts of Saint Thomas» (cf. § 30, 8). Polemical and apologetic works of Bardesanes were known to Eusebius, Epiphanius, and Theodoret[4]. The polemical works were dialogues, written against Marcion, and were translated from Syriac into Greek. The dialogue «On (or Against) Fate» (*περὶ* or *κατὰ εἱμαρμένης*) is mentioned by the three Greek writers just

[1] Serm. adv. haer., 1—56. [2] Hist. eccl., iii. 16. [3] L. c., sermo 53.
[4] *Eus.,* Hist. eccl., iv. 30. *Epiph.,* Haer., 56. 1. *Theodor.,* Haeret. fab. comp. i. 22.

quoted; Eusebius took from it[1] two long passages. It is yet extant in Syriac under the title «Book of the Laws of the Countries». In this work Bardesanes, the chief interlocutor, proves that the peculiar characters of men are not affected by the position of the stars at their birth, since various countries have the same laws, customs, and usages. However, the dialogue does not pretend to be written by Bardesanes, but by his disciple Philip. In later Oriental works we meet mention of other books of Bardesanes. Moses of Chorene[2] attributes to him a history of the kings of Armenia. Ibn Abi Jakub, in his literary history known as «Fihrist», attributes to Bardesanes a work on light and darkness, another on the spiritual nature of truth, and a third on the movable and the immovable.

*A. Merx,* Bardesanes von Edessa, nebst einer Untersuchung über das Verhältnis der clementinischen Rekognitionen zu dem Buche der Gesetze der Länder, Halle, 1863. *A. Hilgenfeld,* Bardesanes, der letzte Gnostiker, Leipzig, 1864. Cf. also the articles of *F. J. A. Hort,* in the Dictionary of Christ. Biography, i. 250—260, of *J. M. Schönfelder,* in the Kirchenlexikon of *Wetzer* and *Welte,* 2. ed., i. 1995—2002, and of *G. Krüger,* in the Realenzykl. für prot. Theol. und Kirche, ii. 400—403. For the «Book of the Laws of Countries» (Syriac and English), cf. *W. Cureton,* Spicilegium Syriacum, Lond., 1855, pp. 1—21, 21—34. There is a German translation in *Merx* l. c., pp. 25—55. It has also been translated from Syriac into French by *F. Nau,* Bardesanes, astrologue, Le livre des lois des pays, Paris, 1899.

7. MARCION AND APELLES. Marcion was the son of a bishop of Sinope in Pontus. About the year 140 he appeared in Rome as a wealthy navigator. Though he had been excommunicated by his father for licentious conduct, he managed to secure a reception among the Christians of that city. A few years later (about 144), he was no longer in communion with the authorities of the Roman church, and was bent on founding a church under his own auspices. Owing to his success in this undertaking, the Pontic skipper affected both his contemporaries and posterity more profoundly than any heresiarch of the second century. Beginning with a strict adherence to the Syrian Gnostic Cerdon, then resident at Rome, he excogitated a doctrinal system based upon the irreconcilability of justice and grace, the law and the gospel, Judaism and Christianity. Because of this irreconcilable antithesis, two principles must be admitted, both eternal and uncreated, a good God and a just but wicked God; the latter is the Creator of this world[3]. Moreover, not only should we reject the Old Testament as promulgated by the just and wicked God, but we must look on the New Testament as corrupted by the primitive apostles, who interpolated it with their Jewish ideas. Only Paul, the enemy of Judaism, and his disciple Luke, were faithful interpreters of the teachings of the Lord. Consequently, Marcion

[1] Praep. evang., vi. 10. [2] Hist. Arm., ii. 66. [3] *Tert.,* Adv. Marc., i. 6.

gave to his disciples a new Sacred Scripture in two parts: an *εὐαγγέλιον* and an *ἀποστολικόν*. This Marcionite «Evangelium» was a mutilated and variously disfigured production. The «Apostolicum» included ten manipulated letters of St. Paul: Galatians, First and Second Corinthians, Romans, First and Second Thessalonians, Laodiceans = Ephesians, Colossians, Philippians, and Philemon. With the aid of several opponents of Marcion it is possible to reconstruct in large measure the original text of this Marcionite Bible [1], which enjoyed canonical authority among the followers of the sect. Ephraem Syrus is witness to a Syriac version of it; by the time of Tertullian it had already been frequently «reformed» [2]. To justify his recension of the Bible, Marcion composed a large work known as Antitheses *(ἀντιθέσεις)* in which he arranged, in parallel columns, sentences of the Old and the New Testament, and from their pretended antilogies concluded that the two component parts of the Bible of the Church were irreconcilable. «Hae sunt», says Tertullian, «antitheses Marcionis, id est contrariae oppositiones, quae conantur discordiam evangelii cum lege committere, ut ex diversitate sententiarum instrumenti diversitatem quoque argumententur deorum» [3]. According to other statements of Tertullian and of Ephraem Syrus the work of Marcion contained not only an exposition of the principles of Marcionitic Christianity, but also a more or less detailed commentary on his own Bible. It seems that Marcion discussed in a Letter the reason of his abandonment of the Church [4]. — Among his disciples Apelles was prominent as a writer. He turned from the dualism of Marcion to a certain monism, maintaining that the World-Creator was himself created by the good God. In his «Syllogisms» *(συλλογισμοί)* he undertook to prove that in the books of Moses there was nothing but lies; hence they could not have God as their author. It was an extensive work, as may be imagined from the fact that the criticism of the biblical account of the fall of the first man was found in its thirty-eighth book [5]. In his «Manifestations» *(φανερώσεις)* Apelles described the pretended revelations of Philumena, a Roman female visionary [6] The «Gospel of Apelles» first mentioned by Jerome [7] was probably nothing more than a later elaboration or a new recension of the Gospel of Marcion.

*A. Hilgenfeld,* Die Ketzergeschichte des Urchristentums, Leipzig, 1884, pp. 316—341: «Cerdon und Marcion»; pp. 522—543: «Marcion und Appelles». *A. Harnack,* De Appellis gnosi monarchica, Leipzig, 1874. *H. U. Meyboom,* Marcion en de Marcionieten, Leyden, 1888. For earlier tenta-

[1] Especially *Tert.,* l. c., v. *Epiph.,* Haer., 42, and the author of Dialog. Adamantii de recta in Deum fide.

[2] *Tert.,* l. c., iv. 5; cf. De praescr. haeret., c. 42. [3] Adv. Marc., i. 19.

[4] *Tert.,* l. c., i. 1; iv. 4; De carne Christi, c. 2. [5] *Ambros.,* De parad., v. 28.

[6] *Tert.,* De praescr. haeret., c. 30; De carne Christi, c. 6; al.

[7] Comm. in Matth., prol.

tive reconstructions of the Gospel of Marcion cf. *A. Hahn,* 1823 and 1832; *Hilgenfeld,* 1850; *G. Volckmar,* 1852; also the work of *W. C. van Manen* (1887) on the reconstruction of Galatians according to Marcion. All such efforts are more or less antiquated since the work of *Zahn,* Gesch. des neutestamentl. Kanons, ii. 409—529, «Marcions Neues Testament» (an essay in text-reconstruction); cf. ib., i. 587—718, a criticism of the Bible of Marcion. *A. Hahn,* Antitheses Marcionis gnostici, liber deperditus, nunc quoad eius fieri potuit restitutus, Königsberg, 1823. *A. Harnack,* Sieben neue Bruchstücke der Syllogismen des Apelles (from *Ambros.,* De parad., vi. 30—32; vii. 35; viii. 38, 40, 41), in Texte und Untersuchungen (1890), vi. 3, 111—120; cf. *Harnack,* ib., xx., new series (1900), v. 3, 93—100. *F. J. J Jackson,* Christian Difficulties in the Second and Twentieth Centuries. Study of Marcion and his relation to modern thought, London, 1903. See *G. Salmon,* Marcion, in Dict. of Christian Biography, London, 1880, iii. 817—824.

8. THE ENCRATITES. These heretics rejected as sinful both matrimony and the use of meat and wine. The chief spokesmen of their doctrines in the second century were Tatian (§ 18) and Julius Cassianus. About the year 170 the latter published at least two works: one entitled *ἐξηγητικά* in several books[1], and the other «On continence or celibacy» *(περὶ ἐγκρατείας ἢ περὶ εὐνουχίας)*[2].

*Hilgenfeld,* Die Ketzergesch. des Urchristentums, pp. 546—549. *Zahn,* Gesch. des neutestamentl. Kanons, ii. 632—636, 750.

### § 26. The Judaistic Literature.

1. THE EBIONITES. The heretical group known as Ebionites saw in Jesus a son of Joseph, and denied His birth of the Blessed Virgin and the Holy Ghost[3] Several of their authoritative books are mentioned by Epiphanius[4], among others «the so-called Journeys of Peter» (see below) and the Gospel of the Ebionites (§ 29, 3). Toward the end of the second century the Ebionite Symmachus, known also for his translation of the Old Testament into Greek, wrote an exegetical work in which he attacked the Gospel of St. Matthew[5]. It is supposed that this work is identical with that known to the Syrian writer Ebed Jesu († 1318) as *Liber Symmachi de distinctione praeceptorum.*

*G. Mercati,* L' età di Simmaco l' interprete e S. Epifanio, Modena, 1892.

2. THE ELKESAITES. These heretics, known also as Sampsæi, professed an odd mixture of Judaism, Christianity and Heathenism. Epiphanius tells us[6] that they possessed two symbolic books, one under the name of Elxai, founder of the sect, and another under the name of his brother Jexai. Both Epiphanius[7] and Hippolytus[8] quote several passages from the Book of Elxai. The date of its

[1] *Clem. Al.,* Strom., i. 21, 101; cf. *Hier.,* Comm. in Gal. ad vi. 18.
[2] *Clem. Al.,* Strom., iii. 13, 91—92.
[3] *Iren.,* Adv. haer., iii. 21, 1; v. 1, 3. [4] Haer. 30.
[5] *Eus.,* Hist. eccl., vi. 17; cf. *Hier.,* De viris illustr., c. 54.
[6] Haer. 53, 1. [7] Haer. 19, 1 ff.; 53, 1. [8] Philos., ix. 13—17.

composition would be about the year 100, according to Hilgenfeld; others locate it, more accurately, about the year 200.

The fragments of the Book of Elxai are collected in *Hilgenfeld,* Novum Testamentum extra canonem rec., 2. ed., Leipzig, 1881, fasc. iii. 227—240; cf. *Id.,* Judentum und Judenchristentum, Leipzig, 1886, pp. 103 ff.

3. THE SO-CALLED CLEMENTINES (CLEMENTINE LITERATURE). Under this title *(Κλημέντια)* are usually collected certain writings that treat of the life of St. Clement of Rome, and pretend to have been written by him. They are the Recognitions of Clement, the Homilies, and two Letters. The ten books of the Recognitions are no longer extant in the original Greek, but only in a Latin version made by Rufinus of Aquileia, and in a Syriac revision. According to the Latin version Clement was much troubled in his youth by doubts concerning the immortality of the soul, the origin of the world, and similar matters. Hearing that the Son of God had appeared in Judaea he made a journey to the East, where he met the Apostle Peter, from whom he received the desired enlightenment. Thereupon he became his disciple and accompanied him on his journeys. At Cæsarea he was witness to the dispute of St. Peter with Simon Magus (Recog. ii. 20—iii. 48). Somewhat later, Clement made known to the Apostle the circumstances of his early life. When he was five years of age, his mother, Matthidia, a relative of the Emperor, had fled from Rome as the result of a dream, taking with her his two elder brothers, the twins Faustinus and Faustus. They were sought for in vain; indeed, his father Faustinianus never returned from the toilsome and fruitless journey he undertook in search of wife and children (vii. 8—10). But the long separated family was now to be re-united. During an excursion from Antharadus to the island of Aradus, St. Peter discovered in a beggar woman the mother of his disciple. Two other disciples and companions of the Apostle made themselves known as Faustinus and Faustus, the brothers of Clement. Finally the father Faustinianus was discovered by St. Peter. It is to this happy ending of the story that the work owes its peculiar title: *Recognitiones* = *ἀναγνώσεις, ἀναγνωρισμοί.* It was also known to antiquity by other titles, among them *Περίοδοι Πέτρου* or *Κλήμεντος, Itinerarium, Historia, Gesta Clementis.* The chief scope of the work, however, was not the story of the vicissitudes of St. Clement, but rather the recommendation of certain teachings of St. Peter that are interwoven with the narrative. The book is really a religious romance. In the Latin version the didactic exposition of the original is reproduced in a very incomplete way In a preliminary remark Rufinus says that there were current two recensions of the Greek text (in graeco eiusdem operis *ἀναγνώσεων,* hoc est recognitionum, duas editiones haberi), and that in both were found theological

discussions (quaedam de ingenito Deo genitoque disserta et de aliis nonnullis), that he had thought it proper to omit. By a second recension of the work Rufinus doubtless means the Homilies *(ὁμιλίαι)*, the Greek text of which we possess. They are twenty in number, and are prefaced by two Letters of Peter and Clement, respectively, to James of Jerusalem. In the first letter Peter requests James to keep rigorously secret the discourses he has sent him *(τῶν ἐμῶν κηρυγμάτων ἃς ἔπεμψά σοι βίβλους*, c. 1*)*. In the second Clement informs James that he had received episcopal consecration from Peter a little before the latter's death. He had also been instructed to send to James a lengthy report concerning his past life; he performs this duty by sending him an extract of the discourses that Peter had already sent to James. The work pretends therefore to have been sent to James under the title of «Clement's Epitome of the Sermons made by Peter during his journeys» (*Κλήμεντος τῶν Πέτρου ἐπιδημίων κηρυγμάτων ἐπιτομή*, c. 20), a title that recalls at once the pretended «Journeys of Peter written by Clement» *(ταῖς περιόδοις καλουμέναις Πέτρου ταῖς διὰ Κλήμεντος γραφείσαις)*, which Epiphanius (Haer. 30, 15) tells us was an Ebionite work. The story of Clement, as told in the Homilies, is again a cover for the doctrinal teaching of Peter. With the exception of a few insignificant details (Hom. xii. 8) the story tallies in all essentials with that related in the Recognitions. The doctrinal ideas exhibit close conformity with those of the Elkesaites. The heathen elements of the Elkesaite teaching are no longer apparent, but the essential identity of Christianity and Judaism is very energetically maintained. It is the same prophet who revealed himself in Adam, Moses and Jesus. As it fell to Moses to restore the primitive religion when obscured and disfigured by sin, so the new revelation in Jesus had become necessary by reason of the gradual darkening and alteration of the original Mosaic revelation (Hom. ii. 38 ff.). Finally, the two Epitomes or Compendia omit the theological discussions, recapitulate the narrative of the Homilies, and relate the doings of St. Clement at Rome, together with his martyrdom. While both Recognitions and Homilies certainly antedate the Epitomes, the question of priority raised by the similarity of the subject matter of the Recognitions and the Homilies is not an easy one. It has been answered in so many contradictory ways, that there is an urgent need for a new examination of the problem. Hilgenfeld believes that the Recognitions are the earlier work, of which the Homilies offer us an enlargement. Uhlhorn maintains the priority of the Homilies, and Lehmann finds in the Recognitions two distinct sections, the first of which (Book I—III) is older than the Homilies, while the second (Book IV—X) is posterior to them. Langen places the composition of the Homilies at Caesarea toward the end of the second century, that of the Recognitions at Antioch about

the beginning of the third century. Both works, however, he declares, are merely revisions, or rather polemical refutations of a still earlier work, written after the destruction of Jerusalem in 135, with the purpose of establishing at Rome the supreme ecclesiastical primacy. While it is likely enough that older writings have been embodied in the Clementines, as we now read them, the hypothesis of a primitive work of this character and tendency is both arbitrary and untenable. On the other hand, it is probably true that, in their traditional shape, the Clementines exhibit a Judaizing tendency, in so far as they desire to see the primacy transferred from Peter (and Clement) to James, from Rome to Jerusalem (or Cæsarea and Antioch).

The first printed edition of the Recognitions from the Latin version of Rufinus was published by *J. Faber Stapulensis* (Lefèvre d'Estaples), Paris, 1504. An improved text was published by *Cotelerius,* Patres aevi apostolici, i., Paris, 1672. For other editions cf. *Schoenemann*, Bibl. hist.-litt. Patrum lat., i. 633 ff. The most recent is that of *E. G. Gersdorf,* Leipzig, 1838 (Bibl. Patr. eccles. lat. sel., i; *Migne,* PG., i). Clementis Romani Recognitiones syriace *P. A. de Lagarde* edidit, Leipzig and London, 1861.

The Homilies were first edited by *Cotelier* (l. c.), but this edition did not go beyond the middle of the nineteenth Homily, where the manuscript ended from which the text was taken. Similarly the edition of *A. Schwegler,* Stuttgart, 1847 The complete text is reproduced in *Migne* (PG., ii), from the edition of *A. R. M. Dressel,* Clementis Romani quae feruntur homiliae viginti nunc primum integrae, Göttingen, 1853. *P. de Lagarde* was the first to publish (the Greek text without translation) an edition answering in all essentials to modern requirements. Clementina, edited by *P. de Lagarde,* Leipzig, 1865; the introduction (pp. 3—28) was reprinted by him in his Mitteilungen, Göttingen, 1884, pp. 26—54. A remark of Lagarde's is worth quoting: «I think we shall not make any substantial progress without a proper and continuous commentary on the Clementine Recognitions and Homilies» (Clementina, p. 11). Rufinus' version of the Letter of Clement to James, which even in the time of Rufinus was prefixed to the Recognitions, was edited anew by *O. F. Fritzsche,* Epistola Clementis ad Jacobum (progr.), Zürich, 1873. *Dressel* published both Epitomes. Clementinorum Epitome duae, Leipzig, 1859. *A. Hilgenfeld,* Die clementinischen Rekognitionen und Homilien, Jena, 1848. *G. Uhlhorn,* Die Homilien und Rekognitionen des Clemens Romanus, Göttingen, 1854. *J. Lehmann,* Die clementinischen Schriften, Gotha, 1869. *G. Frommberger,* De Simone Mago. Pars prima: De origine Pseudo-Clementinorum (Dissert. inaug.), Breslau, 1886. *H. M. van Nes,* Het Nieuwe Testament in de Clementinen (Dissert. inaug.), Amsterdam, 1887 *J. Langen,* Die Clemensromane, Gotha, 1890. Cf. *A. Brüll* in Theol. Quartalschr. (1891), lxxiii. 577—601; *C. Bigg,* The Clementine Homilies, in Studia biblica et ecclesiastica, Oxford, 1890, ii. 157—193; *F Hort,* Notes introductory to the study of the Clementine Recognitions, London, 1901; *J. Chapman,* Origen and the Date of Pseudo-Clemens, in Journal of Theol. Studies (1902), iii. 436—441; *J. Franko,* Beiträge aus dem Kirchenslavischen zu den Apokryphen des Neuen Testaments. I: Zu den Pseudo-Clementinen, in Zeitschr. für die neutestamentl. Wissensch. (1902), iii. 146—155. For another and a later Clementine apocryphal writing cf. *G. Mercati,* Note di letteratura biblica e cristiana antica (Studi e Testi, v), Rome, 1901, 80—81, 238—241. *J Bergmann,* Les éléments juifs dans les pseudo-Clémentines, in Revue des études juives, 1903, pp. 59—98.

*H. U. Meyboom*, De Clemens-Roman. Part I: Synoptische Vertaling van den Tekst, Groningen, 1902. Part II, Groningen, 1904. *A. Hilgenfeld*, Origenes und Pseudo-Clemens, in Zeitschr. für wissenschaftl. Theol. (1903), xlvi. 342—351. *Chapman* (l. c., p. 441) places the Clementines in early part of the fourth century; cf. *Kellner*, in Theol. Revue (1903), ii. 421—422. *H. Waitz*, Die Pseudo-Clementinen, Homilien und Rekognitionen. Eine quellenkritische Untersuchung (Texte und Untersuchungen [Leipzig 1904], x. 4). *A. Hilgenfeld*, Pseudo-Clemens in moderner Façon, in Zeitschr. für wissenschaftl. Theol., 1904, pp. 545—567. *A. C. Headlam*, The Clementine Literature, in Journal of Theol. Studies (1901), iii. 41—58. *F. H. Chase*, The Clementine Literature, in *Hastings'* Dict. of the Bible (1900), art. «Peter», p. 775.

### § 27. The Montanist Literature.

Montanism arose in Phrygia and called itself «the new prophecy», the completion of the revelation made by God to man. In their ecstatic exaltation or delirium Montanus and his female companions, Priscilla (Prisca) and Maximilla, pretended to be the organs of the Paraclete; they were to be its voice, not so much for the communication of new truths of faith as for new and higher demands upon Christian life. Certain collections of oracles of the prophetic trifolium — «countless books», says Hippolytus[1] — were held by the Montanists as equal in authority to the books of biblical revelation. They were held to be «new Scriptures», says the Roman priest Gaius[2]. They had also for use in their meetings new spiritual chants or Psalms[3]. The work of the Montanist writer Asterius Urbanus, cited[4] by an anonymous Antimontanist in 192—193, was probably a collection of oracular replies. The Antimontanist work of the apologist Miltiades (§ 19, 1) gave his opponents an occasion to reply[5]. Themison, prominent among the Montanists of Phrygia, «imitated the Apostle and wrote a Catholic Letter, i. e. addressed to all Christians»[6]. Early in the third century a certain Proclus wrote in defence of Montanism at Rome[7]. The most brilliant convert to the «new prophecy» was Tertullian of Carthage (§ 50).

*G. N. Bonwetsch*, Die Geschichte des Montanismus, Erlangen, 1881. *A. Hilgenfeld*, Die Ketzergeschichte des Urchristentums, Leipzig, 1884, pp. 560—601 «Die Kataphryger». *Th. Zahn*, Forschungen zur Gesch. des neutestamentl. Kanons und der altkirchl. Literatur, Erlangen and Leipzig, 1893, v. 3—57: «Die Chronologie des Montanismus».

### § 28. The New Testament Apocrypha.

1. GENERAL NOTIONS. The term, New Testament Apocrypha, is given to a widely ramified class of writings that imitate those

[1] Philos., viii. 19. [2] Apud *Eus.*, Hist. eccl., vi. 20, 3.
[3] *Tert.*, Adv. Marc., v. 8; De anima, c. 9.
[4] *Eus.*, Hist. eccl., v. 16, 17. [5] Ib., v. 17, 1.
[6] Apollonius apud *Eus.*, l. c., v. 18, 5.
[7] Gaius apud *Eus.*, l. c., iii. 31, 4.

of the New Testament. The subject-matter is the same, and usually these works are attributed to the authors of the New Testament. In view of their form and plan they may be divided like the canonical Scriptures into Gospels, Acts of the Apostles, Letters of the Apostles, and Apocalypses. In origin and tendency they are partly works of heretical and partisan authors, and partly works of edification written with good intentions. Indeed, the silence of the New Testament concerning the youth of our Lord, the life of His Mother, and the later history of the Apostles, seemed especially destined to excite pious imaginations; in this way sprang up about the trunk of the historico-canonical Scriptures a wild and luxurious vegetation of legends. But the majority of the Apocrypha, especially the Gospels and Acts of the Apostles, were written for the purpose of propagating the doctrines of some particular heresy. Among the Gnostics especially this kind of literature spread with almost unearthly rapidity. All those Apocrypha that affect more or less an historical form are characterized especially, from a literary point of view, by a certain weirdness, extravagance and absurdity. It has been often and rightly remarked that the relations of the apocryphal historiography to the historical books of the New Testament are such as to bring out very clearly the purity and truth of the canonical narratives. Withal, the apocryphal legends and romances have played a prominent role in history. Their subject-matter was very attractive; hence in many lands they furnished the material for pious reading or conversation, and were in a way the spiritual nourishment of the people. Not only did harmless legends meet with acceptance and approval, but several distinctly heretical works, revised and stripped of their errors, continued to affect Christian thought long after the disappearance of their original circle of readers.

The most important of the older collections of New Testament Apocrypha is that of the well-known literary historian *J. A. Fabricius*, Codex apocryphus Novi Testamenti, 2 voll., Hamburg, 1703—1719. The first volume was reprinted in 1719, the second in 1743. *J. C. Thilo* planned as his life-work a complete critical collection; apart from separate editions of several apocryphal Acts of the Apostles, he prepared only the first volume of his projected work; it offers an entirely new, and in every way admirable, recension of many apocryphal Gospels: Codex apocryphus Novi Testamenti, Leipzig, 1832, i. A work of much less value is the edition brought out by *W. Giles*, containing chiefly apocryphal Gospels: Codex apocryphus Novi Testamenti, 2 voll., London, 1853. Since then there have appeared only collective editions of specific groups of New Testament Apocrypha, Gospels, Acts, etc. (cf. pp. 87 ff.). *H. Hilgenfeld*, Novum Testamentum extra canonem receptum, fasc. iv, Leipzig, 1866, 2. ed., 1884. *M. Rh. James*, Apocrypha anecdota, Cambridge, 1893 (Texts and Studies, ii. 3). *Id.*, Apocrypha anecdota, 2. series, Cambridge, 1897 (Texts and Studies, v. 1). *P. Lacan*, Fragments d'Apocryphes coptes de la Bibliothèque Nationale, publiés dans les Mémoires de la Mission française d'archéologie orientale, Le Caire, 1904.

The editions of the Syriac Apocrypha of the New Testament are indicated by *E. Nestle,* in his Syrische Grammatik, 2. ed., Berlin, 1888, Litteratura, 27 ff.; cf. *Nestle,* in Realencykl. für prot. Theol. und Kirche, Leipzig, 3. ed., 1897, iii. 168. *R. Duval,* La littérature syriaque, Paris, 1899 (Biblioth. de l'enseignement de l'histoire ecclésiastique. Anciennes littératures chrétiennes, ii.), pp. 95—120, with corrections and additions, Paris, 1900, pp. 20—21. For the Apocrypha in Old-Slavonic cf. *N. Bonwetsch* apud *Harnack,* Gesch. der altchristl. Literatur, i. 902—917. For the Coptic Apocrypha cf. *C. Schmidt* apud *Harnack* l. c., i. 919—924. *R. Basset,* Les Apocryphes éthiopiens traduits en français, Paris, 1893 ff. Cf. *James,* Apocrypha anecd., 2. series, pp. 166 ff. Recent collections of versions: *K. Fr. Borberg,* Bibliothek der neutestamentl. Apokryphen, Stuttgart, 1841, vol. i. (the only volume printed). *Migne,* Dictionnaire des Apocryphes, 2 voll., Paris, 1856—1858. — *Movers (Kaulen),* Apokryphen und Apokryphenliteratur, in Kirchenlexikon of *Wetzer* and *Welte,* 2. ed., Freiburg, 1882, i. 1036 to 1084, a profoundly erudite study. *R. Hofmann,* Apokryphen des Neuen Testamentes, in Realencykl. für prot. Theol. und Kirche, Leipzig, 3. ed., 1896, i. 653—670. *H. J. Holtzmann,* Lehrbuch der hist.-krit. Einleitung in das Neue Testament, 2. ed., Freiburg, 1886, pp. 534—554: «Die neutestamentlichen Apokryphen». *E. Preuschen,* Die Reste der außerkanonischen Evangelien und urchristlichen Überlieferungen, Gießen, 1901. *B. Pick,* The Extra-Canonical Life of Christ, New York, 1903. *James de Quincy Donehoo,* The Apocryphal and Legendary Life of Christ, New York, 1903. *F. H. Chase,* Encyclopedia Biblica.

2. APOCRYPHAL GOSPELS. By far the greater part of the Apocryphal Gospels that have been preserved, or are in any way known to us, were written in the first three centuries by Gnostics, with the purpose of lending an apostolic sanction to their doctrines. Not a few of these works enjoyed in particular Gnostic sects or group of sects an authority identical with or similar to that of the canonical Gospels in the Catholic Church. We have mentioned the Diatessaron of Tatian (§ 18, 3), the Gospel of Basilides (§ 25, 2), the Valentinian Gospel of the Truth (§ 25, 5), the Gospel of Marcion and Apelles (§ 25, 7) etc., and shall have occasion to mention others. If we look at the structure and content of the apocryphal gospels we see that some are based on the canonical books whose material they develop under the influence of their own doctrines, others invent their stories quite freely. The latter treat of the youth of our Lord or of His actions after the Resurrection. As early as the time of St. Irenaeus, the Gnostics were wont to lament the silence of the Gospels about the life of Jesus Christ before His Baptism and after His Resurrection, they also relate that, after the latter, He spent eighteen months on earth in order to initiate more profoundly some privileged disciples in the mysteries of His teaching [1]. The Gospel according to the Hebrews, and the Ebionite Gospel, belong to other heretical or sectarian communities; the Protevangelium Jacobi is the product of ecclesiastical circles.

[1] Adv. haer., i. 30, 14; cf. i. 3, 2.

Evangelia apocrypha, edidit *C. Tischendorf*, Leipzig, 1853, 2. ed., 1876. *F. Robinson*, Coptic Apocryphal Gospels, Cambridge, 1896 (Texts and Studies, iv. 2). *M. N Speranskij*, The Slavonic Apocryphal Gospels (Russian), Moscow, 1895. *E. Preuschen*, Antilegomena. Die Reste der außerkanonischen Evangelien und urchristlichen Überlieferungen, Gießen, 1901.

*R. Clemens*, Die geheim gehaltenen oder sog. apokryphischen Evangelien, ins Deutsche übertragen, Stuttgart, 1852. *B. H. Cowper*, The Apocryphal Gospels and other Documents relating to the history of Christ, translated from the originals, 6. ed., London, 1897. *C. Tischendorf*, De evangeliorum apocryphorum origine et usu, The Hague, 1891. *R. A. Lipsius*, Apocryphal Gospels, in Dict. of Christ. Biogr. (London, 1880), ii. 700—717. *A. Tappehorn*, Außerbiblische Nachrichten oder die Apokryphen über die Geburt, Kindheit und das Lebensende Jesu und Mariä, Paderborn, 1885. *Th. Zahn*, Gesch. des neutestamentl. Kanons, Erlangen and Leipzig, 1892, ii. 621—797: «Über apokryphe Evangelien». *J. G. Tasker*, (art.) «Apocryphal Gospels» in *Hastings'* Dict. of the Bible (extra vol.), 1904, pp. 420 to 438. *Battifol*, (art.) «Evangiles Apocryphes» in *Vigouroux*, Dict. de la Bible. Tome II, col. 2114—2118.

3. APOCRYPHAL ACTS OF THE APOSTLES. The ancient traditions concerning the lives and deaths of the Apostles were soon enriched, for many reasons, with an abundance of fabulous tales; according as this narrative-material was committed to writing, there took place a still stronger colouring of these stories. The Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles are in reality religious romances. Some of them seek merely to satisfy a pious curiosity. Most of them, however, under the cover of marvellous and pleasure-giving tales, tend to create an opening for heretical doctrines that are artfully insinuated in them. In his commentary on the apocryphal Third Letter to the Corinthians, Ephraem Syrus reproaches the followers of Bardesanes with having changed the missionaries of the Lord into preachers of the impiety of Bardesanes. Later, especially since the beginning of the fifth century, a certain Leucius, or, as Photius writes it[1], Leucius Charinus, is very often mentioned as the writer of heretical Acts of the Apostles, especially of Acts of St. John. The earliest traces of this very dubious personality are found in Epiphanius[2] and Pacianus[3]. It is probable that in the introduction to the Acts of John, which have reached us only in a very fragmentary state, the author made himself known as Leucius, a disciple of the Apostle. Probably the same hand wrote the equally Gnostic Acts of Peter and perhaps the no less Gnostic Acts of Andrew. Many Gnostic Acts were «worked over» at a later date by Catholics, in such a way as to retain, with more or less consistency, the tales about the journeys and miracles of the Apostles, while the heretical discourses and teachings were cut out. The original Gnostic texts have generally perished, while the Catholic revisions of the same have been preserved, at least

[1] Bibl. Cod. 114. [2] Haer. 51, 6.
[3] Ep. i. ad Sympr., c. 2.

in fragments. Of the Acts of the Apostles written originally by Catholics only a few remnants have reached our time.

Foremost and epoch-making among the works on the Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles is that by *R. A. Lipsius,* Die apokryphen Apostelgeschichten und Apostellegenden, 2 voll., Braunschweig 1883—1890, with a supplementary fascicule. Acta Apostolorum apocrypha, edidit *C. Tischendorf,* Leipzig, 1851. Cf. Additamenta ad Acta Apostolorum apocrypha in *Tischendorf.* Apocalypses apocryphae, Leipzig, 1886, xlvii—l. 137—167 Acta Apostolorum apocrypha, post C. Tischendorf denuo ediderunt *R. A. Lipsius* et *M. Bonnet.* Pars prior, Leipzig, 1891. Partis alterius vol. i., 1898. Supplementum codicis apocryphi i. Acta Thomae. Edidit *M. Bonnet,* Leipzig, 1883. Suppl. cod. apocr. ii: Acta Andreae. Ed. *M. Bonnet,* Paris, 1895.

For similar apocryphal material in Syriac, cf. *W. Wright,* Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles, 2 voll., London, 1871. *I. Guidi* has edited (Rendiconti della Regia Accademia dei Lincei, 1887—1888) and translated into Italian (Giornale della Società Asiatica Italiana [1888], ii. 1—66) some Coptic fragments of Acts of the Apostles. Other fragments were published in 1890 by *O. von Lemm.* For further detail cf. *Lipsius,* Die apokryphen Apostelgeschichten und Apostellegenden, Supplement, pp. 98 ff., 259 ff. *Id.,* Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles, in Dict. of Christ. Biogr., London, 1880, i. 17—32. *S. C. Malan* translated into English (1871) an Ethiopic collection (from the Coptic through the Arabic) of Acts of the Apostles, under the title «Conflicts of the Apostles». *E. A. W. Budge* began the publication of the Ethiopic text with an English translation, vol. i, London, 1899, vol. ii (the last), 1901. *A. v. Gutschmid,* Die Königsnamen in den apokryphen Apostelgeschichten (Rhein. Museum für Philol., new series [1864], xix. 161—183, 380—401, reprinted in Kleine Schriften von A. v Gutschmid, herausgeg. von *Fr. Rühl,* Leipzig, 1890, ii. 332—394. *Zahn,* Gesch. des neutestamentl. Kanons (1892), ii. 2, 797—910: «Über apokryphe Apokalypsen und Apostelgeschichten». *Duchesne,* Les anciens recueils des légendes apostoliques (Compte rendu du III. Congrès scientifique internat. des Catholiques, section v (Bruxelles, 1895), pp. 67—79.

4. APOCRYPHAL LETTERS OF THE APOSTLES. In comparison with the long series of Apocryphal Gospels and Acts, there are but few similar documents in the shape of special Letters, unconnected with larger works. During the first three or four centuries we come across only a few Letters or Collections of Letters current under the name of St. Paul. The apocryphal third Letter to the Corinthians, originally a part of the apocryphal Acta Pauli, enjoyed for a time canonical authority in the churches of Syria and Armenia.

There is no special edition of all the Apocryphal Letters of the Apostles. Cf. *Zahn*, Gesch. des neutestamentl. Kanons, ii. 2, 565—621: «Unechte Paulusbriefe».

5. APOCRYPHAL APOCALYPSES. An Apocalypse of Peter has reached us in fragments. It belongs to the first half of the second century; all other apocryphal Apocalypses bearing New Testament names are of a later date.

Apocalypses apocryphae. Maximam partem nunc primum edidit *C. Tischendorf,* Leipzig, 1866. *Zahn,* l. c., ii. 2, 797—910 «Über apokryphe Apokalypsen und Apostelgeschichten». *R. A. Lipsius,* Apocryphal Apocalypses, in Dict. of Christ. Biogr., London, 1880, i. 130—132.

### § 29. Apocryphal Gospels.

1. A PAPYRUS-FRAGMENT. A small fragment of a third-century papyrus-codex discovered at Fayûm in Middle Egypt treats of certain prophecies of the Lord concerning the scandal of his disciples and the denial of Peter. It offers a parallel to Mt. xxvi. 30—34 and Mk. xiv. 26—30. Bickell and others look on it as one of those lost evangelical narratives of which Luke speaks in the prologue of his Gospel. It is possible, however, that it is merely a loose quotation from Matthew or Mark, and has drifted down as a relic from some homily or other writing.

The fragment has been several times edited and commented on by *G. Bickell,* first in Zeitschr. für kath. Theol. (1885), ix. 498—504, and finally in Mitteilungen aus der Sammlung der Papyrus Erzherzog Rainer (1892), v. 78—82. Cf. *Ad. Harnack,* in Texte und Untersuchungen (1889), v. 4, 481—497. He thinks it a Gospel-fragment. *Th. Zahn,* Gesch. des neutestamentl. Kanons, Erlangen and Leipzig, 1892, ii. 2, 780—790: in his opinion it is a loose quotation from the Gospels. *P Savi,* in Revue Biblique (1892), i. 321—344, and in Litteratura cristiana antica, Studi critici del P. Paolo Savi barnabita, raccolti e riordinati dal can. *Fr. Polese,* Siena, 1899, pp. 123—145, thought that it looked more like a fragment of a Gospel than a loose quotation from one.

2. THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO THE HEBREWS. Since Lessing († 1781) there is frequent mention in modern Gospel-criticism of the Gospel according to the Hebrews *(τὸ καθ' Ἑβραίους εὐαγγέλιον, Evangelium secundum seu juxta Hebraeos).* It is known to us only through stray references in ancient ecclesiastical writers such as St. Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Eusebius, St. Epiphanius, St. Jerome, and others. A decisive authority attaches to the statements of St. Jerome. To the evidence of earlier writers that the Gospel according to the Hebrews had been written in Hebrew, he added the specific information: «chaldaico quidem syroque sermone, sed hebraicis litteris scriptum est», i. e. it was composed in Aramaic, but transliterated in Hebrew [1]. About 390 Jerome translated it [2] from Aramaic into Greek and Latin; both versions together with the original have fallen a prey to the ravages of time. Perhaps the quotations in Clement of Alexandria and Origen are proof that long before St. Jerome there existed a Greek version of this Gospel. As to its contents, we may gather from St. Jerome and the other witnesses that it was closely related to the canonical Gospel of Matthew, though not identical with it. They were alike in their general disposition and in many more or less characteristic details; the differences consisted in numerous minor additions which in the Gospel according to the Hebrews amplified and completed the subject-matter of Matthew. Apart from the original language of the former, it

[1] Dial. adv. Pelag., iii. 2. [2] De viris illustr., c. 2.

was the unanimous opinion of the entire ancient Church that the Gospel of Matthew had been composed in Aramaic. Hence it is not easy to avoid the hypothesis that the Gospel according to the Hebrews was merely a revision and enlargement of the Gospel of Matthew. It cannot have been composed later than about the middle of the second century, since Hegesippus knew it and made use of it[1]. The Aramaic-speaking Judæo-Christians of Palestine and Syria were known as «Hebrews». Jerome always uses the term «Nazaræi» for those who read and venerate the Gospel according to the Hebrews, on one occasion he calls them Nazaraeans and Ebionites[2]; Epiphanius distinguishes[3] the Nazaræans, generally orthodox, from the clearly heterodox Ebionites. The title *τὸ καθ' Ἑβραίους εὐαγγέλιον* was evidently fashioned after the formula *εὐαγγέλιον κατὰ Ματθαῖον*; it very probably meant no more than the exclusive use of that Gospel in Hebrew circles.

*E. B. Nicholson,* The Gospel according to the Hebrews, London, 1879. *Hilgenfeld,* Nov Test. extra can. rec., fasc. iv (2. ed., Leipzig, 1884), 5—31; cf. *Id.,* in Zeitschr. für wissenschaftl. Theol. (1884), xxvii. 188—194; (1889), xxxii. 280—302. *E. Preuschen,* Antilegomena, Gießen, 1901, pp. 3—8; *D. Gla,* Die Originalsprache des Matthäusevangeliums, Paderborn and Münster, 1887, pp. 101—121; *R. Handmann,* Das Hebräerevangelium (Texte und Untersuchungen, Leipzig, 1888, v 3); *Th. Zahn,* Gesch. des neutestamentl. Kanons, ii. 2, 642—723 (an excellent investigation); *Harnack,* Gesch. der altchristl. Literatur, ii. 1, 631—651.

3. THE GOSPEL OF THE TWELVE AND THE GOSPEL OF THE EBIONITES. Under the name of «Gospel of the Twelve» (which we meet first in Origen)[4], as translated by St. Jerome: «Evangelium iuxta duodecim Apostolos», we are not to understand the Gospel according to the Hebrews[5], but rather the Gospel of the Ebionites, i. e. of those Judæo-Christians who held Jesus for no more than the son of Joseph. This Gospel has also perished; according to St. Epiphanius[6] it was a compilation made for their purpose from the canonical Gospels. The twelve Apostles seem to have been introduced in the role of narrators[7]. It certainly was written in Greek, probably about 150—200.

*Hilgenfeld,* Nov. Test. extra can. rec., fasc. iv, 2. ed., Leipzig, 1884, pp. 32—38. *Preuschen,* Antilegomena, pp. 9—11. *Zahn,* Gesch. des neutestamentl. Kanons, ii. 2, 724—742. *Harnack,* Gesch. der altchristl. Literatur, ii. 1, 625—631. *Zahn* in Neue kirchliche Zeitschr. (1900), xi. 361—370, believes that some Coptic fragments edited by *A. Jakoby* (Ein neues Evangeliumfragment, Straßburg, 1900) and by him assigned to the Gospel of the Egyptians (see below), are really fragments of the Gospel of the Twelve.

[1] *Eus.,* Hist. eccl., iv. 22, 8.
[2] Comm. in Matth. ad xii. 13. [3] Haer. 29—30.
[4] Hom. i. in Lucam: *τὸ ἐπιγεγραμμένον τῶν δώδεκα εὐαγγέλιον.*
[5] *Hier.,* Dial. adv. Pelag., iii. 2. [6] Haer. 30.
[7] *Epiph.,* Haer. 30, 13.

Despite the similarity of title, the latter has no relation with the text published by *J. Rendel Harris,* The Gospel of the Twelve Apostles, together with the Apocalypses of each one of them, edited from the Syriac ms., etc., Cambridge, 1900. Cf. Bessarione VIII (1903—1904), vol. v. 1421, 157—176, for a French translation by *E. Revillout* of some unedited Coptic fragments that he thinks belong to the Gospel of the Twelve.

4. THE GOSPEL OF THE EGYPTIANS. Clement of Alexandria is the first to mention[1] a Gospel of the Egyptians *(τὸ κατ' Αἰγυπτίους εὐαγγέλιον)*, with the observation that it contained a dialogue of the Lord with Salome, quoted by the Encratites (Julius Cassianus) to show that marriage should be abolished. Hippolytus says[2] that the Naassenes made use of expressions from the Gospel of the Egyptians *(τὸ ἐπιγραφόμενον κατ' Αἰγυπτίους εὐαγγέλιον)* in defence of their theories on the soul (and the transmigration of souls?). Epiphanius[3] says that the Sabellians established «their entire error» and in particular their Modalistic doctrine of the Trinity, on the Egyptian Gospel *(τὸ καλούμενον Αἰγύπτιον εὐαγγέλιον)*. In the so-called Second Letter to the Corinthians (12, 2) there is a reference to the above-mentioned dialogue of Salome with the Lord. It is doubtful whether this author used the Egyptian Gospel and indeed whether he drew from any written Gospel. That the Gospel was an heretical one is proven by the circles in which it was most welcome — Encratites, Naassenes, Sabellians; in the words addressed to Salome the Lord is made to preach the Pythagorean theory of numbers. The work was very probably composed in Egypt about 150. — In the territory of ancient Oxyrhynchus, in Lower Egypt, among the débris of a mound of ruins, there was recently found a papyrus folio containing seven Sayings, or mutilated fragments of Sayings, that all begin with the formula *λέγει Ἰησοῦς*. Some of these Sayings are quite similar, in their entirety or in part, to words of our Lord in the canonical Gospels; most of them are quite foreign to the canonical tradition and could never have been pronounced by our Saviour. The folio probably belongs to a book of excerpts from some apocryphal Gospel. The most natural suggestion, owing to the place of its discovery and the Encratite tendency of some of the Sayings, is that they were taken from the Gospel of the Egyptians.

*Hilgenfeld,* Nov. Test. extra can. rec., 2. ed., 1884, fasc. IV, pp. 42—48. *Zahn,* Gesch. des neutestamentl. Kanons, ii. 2, 628—642. *Harnack,* Gesch. der altchristl. Literatur, ii. 1, 612—622. — *B. P Grenfell* and *A. S. Hunt,* Λόγια Ἰησοῦ, London, 1897 They are also found in *Grenfell* and *Hunt,* The Oxyrhynchus Papyri, London, 1898, i. *E. Preuschen,* Antilegomena, pp. 43—44. For the discussions raised by the finding of these «Sayings», cf. *Holtzmann* in Theol. Jahresbericht (1897), xvii. 115 sq.; (1898), xviii. 148 sq., also *Harnack,* Über die jüngst entdeckten Sprüche Jesu, Freiburg, 1897 *G. Esser* in the Katholik (1898), i. 26—43, 137—151. *Ch. Taylor,* The Oxy-

[1] Strom., iii. 9, 63; 13, 93. [2] Philos., v. 7. [3] Haer. 62, 2.

rhynchus Logia, Oxford, 1899. *A. von Scholz* in Theol. Quartalschr. (1900), lxxxii. 1—22. *A. Chiapelli* in Nuova Antologia, 4. series (1897), lxxi. 524—534. *U. Fracassini* in Rivista Bibliografica Italiana (1898), iii. 513—518. *G. Semeria*, Le Parole di Gesù recentemente scoperte e l'ultima fase della critica evangelica, Genova, 1898. For an extensive collection of extra-canonical «Sayings» of Jesus, cf. *A. Resch*, Agrapha, Leipzig, 1898 (Texte und Untersuchungen, v. 4), and *J. H. Ropes*, Die Sprüche Jesu, die in den kanonischen Evangelien nicht überliefert sind, 1896 (ib., xiv. 2).

*C. G. Griffinhoofe*, The Unwritten Sayings of Christ, Words of Our Lord not recorded in the four Gospels, including those recently discovered, Cambridge, 1903. A new series of Logia from the papyri of Oxyrhynchus is promised.

5. THE GOSPEL OF PETER. Until 1892, the Gospel of Peter was known to us only through a few references in ancient writers. The most important of these was found in Eusebius[1], in a fragment of a letter of Serapion, bishop of Antioch (about 200), to the Christians of the neighbouring Rhossus or Rhosus on the coast of Syria. He forbids therein the reading of a pseudo-Petrine Gospel *(ὀνόματι Πέτρου εὐαγγέλιον)*, which by certain additions *(προσδιεσταλμένα)* to the genuine teaching of the Saviour was made to favour Docetism, and had been in use among Docetic-minded Christians of Antioch and Rhossus. It is very probable that to the same text belongs a Gospel-fragment edited in 1892 by Bouriant from an eighth-century codex, which contains the principal part of the Lord's Passion, together with an account of the Resurrection, very diffuse and highly embellished with quite curious miraculous tales. The work bears internal evidence of being a remnant of a pseudo-Petrine writing («But I, Simon Peter», v. 60; «But I, with my companions» v 26). Doceto-Gnostic ideas are also visible in it («But he was silent as one who felt no grief at all» v. 10, in reference to the Lord upon the Cross; cf. v. 19). Von Schubert has proved that the author had before him the four Gospels, and took certain features of his story now from one and now from another, transforming at the same time the canonical narratives in the interest of his own peculiar tendencies. His particular aim is to make the Jews alone responsible for the death of the Lord, and to present the Roman authorities in a light favourable to Christ and the Christians. It was very probably composed, about the middle of the second century, at Antioch in Doceto-Gnostic circles. There is no foundation for the attempt to identify it with the work referred to by St. Justin Martyr as *ἀπομνημονεύματα Πέτρου*[2]. The work referred to under that title in the Dialogue with Trypho (c. 106), is the canonical Gospel of Mark, not the Gospel of Peter. According to Eusebius[3] this Gospel was used more or less exclusively by heretics.

The codex discovered by *U. Bouriant* in a Christian tomb at Akhmim, the ancient Panopolis, in Upper Egypt, contains, besides the above men-

[1] Hist. eccl., vi. 12, 3—6. [2] *Just.*, Dial. c. Tryph., c. 106.
[3] *Eus.*, Hist. eccl., iii. 25, 6—7; cf. iii. 3, 2.

tioned text, an Apocalypse of Peter (§ 32, 1) and important remnants of the Greek Book of Enoch. The discoverer was the first to publish these texts in Mémoires publiés par les membres de la Mission archéologique française au Caire, Paris, 1892, ix., fasc. 1, pp. 91—147, with a facsimile of the whole codex and an introduction by *A. Lods*, ib., ix., fasc. 3 (Paris, 1893). A facsimile of the pages containing the Petrine fragments, and an accurate recension of the same, were soon after published by *O. von Gebhardt*, Das Evangelium und die Apokalypse des Petrus, Leipzig, 1893. The text is also in *Preuschen*, Antilegomena, pp. 14—18; cf. pp. 13—14. The remnants of the Gospel of Peter, the Apocalypse of Peter, the Kerygma Petri, were edited by *E. Klostermann* and *H. Lietzmann*, in Kleine Texte für theol. Vorlesungen und Übungen, Apocrypha i, Bonn, 1903. An English translation was made by *J. Armitage Robinson*, in Ante-Nicene Fathers (Am. ed. 1885), ix. 7—8. For the «literary deluge» that followed the discovery of these fragments cf. *H. Lüdemann*, in Theol. Jahresbericht (1892), xii. 171—173; (1893), xiii. 171—181; (1894), xiv. 185 ff. It will be enough to indicate the following: *Ad. Harnack*, Bruchstücke des Evangeliums und der Apokalypse des Petrus (Texte und Untersuchungen, ix. 2), Leipzig, 1893; 2. ed., ib., 1898. *Funk*, Fragmente des Evangeliums und der Apokalypse des Petrus, in Theol. Quartalschr. (1893), lxxv 255—288. *Th. Zahn*, Das Evangelium des Petrus, Erlangen and Leipzig, 1893. *H. von Schubert*, Die Komposition des pseudopetrinischen Evangelienfragments (with a synoptical table), Berlin, 1893. *D. Völter*, Petrusevangelium oder Ägypterevangeliun? Tübingen, 1893. He is of opinion that the fragment belongs to the Egyptian Gospel (see p. 92). *E. Piccolomini*, Sul testo dei frammenti dell' Evangelio e dell' Apocalissi del Pseudo-Petro, Rome, 1899. *S. Minocchi*, Il Nuovo Testamento tradotto ed annotato, Roma, 1900, pp. 385—391, a partial version of the Gospel of Peter. *V H. Stanton*, The Gospel of Peter: Its History and Character considered in relation to the history of the recognition in the Church of the canonical Gospels, in Journal of Theological Studies (1900), ii. 1—25. *Stocks*, Zum Petrusevangelium, in Neue kirchl. Zeitschr. (1902), xiii. 276—314; ib. (1903), pp. 515—542. *H. Usener*, Eine Spur des Petrusevangeliums (in the Acts of St. Pancratios of Taormina), in Zeitschr. für die neutestamentl. Wissensch. (1902), iii. 353—358. *F. H. Chase*, (art.) «Peter» 10. (1) «The Gospel of Peter», in *Hastings'* Dict. of the Bible (1900), vol. III, p. 776.

6. THE GOSPELS OF MATTHIAS, PHILIP, AND THOMAS. The Gospel of Matthias[1] seems to have been identical with the «Traditions of Matthias»[2] often cited by Clement of Alexandria, a Gnostic work, especially favoured by the Basilidians[3] and probably used by Basilides himself and his son Isidore[4]. The Gospel of Philip was also of Gnostic origin. The name is first found in Epiphanius[5], and it was probably known to the Gnostic author of *Pistis Sophia*[6], between 250 and 300. The Gospel of Thomas was also a Gnostic product. It is mentioned by Hippolytus[7] and Origen[8] and very probably existed before the time of Irenaeus[9]. In its actual forms, Greek, Latin, Syriac, Slavonic, it is only an abbreviated and expurgated copy of

[1] *Orig.*, Hom. 1 in Luc. *Eus.* l. c., iii. 25, 6—7.
[2] *Clem. Al.*, Strom., ii. 9, 45; vii. 13, 82: *παραδόσεις Ματθίου*.
[3] Ib., vii. 17, 108. [4] *Hippol.*, Philos., vii. 20.
[5] Haer. 26, 13. [6] Cf. the edition of *Schwartze-Petermann*, pp. 69 ff.
[7] Philos., v. 7. [8] Hom. 1 in Luc. [9] Adv. haer., i. 20, 1.

the original work; the longer and perhaps the older of the various recensions bears in Tischendorf the title: *Θωμᾶ Ἰσραηλίτου φιλοσόφου ῥητὰ εἰς τὰ παιδικὰ τοῦ κυρίου.* It is addressed to the Christians converted from heathenism (c. 1) and relates a series of miracles said to have been performed by Christ from the fifth to the twelfth year of His youth. The Divine Child is presented to us utterly without dignity, and is made to exhibit His miraculous powers in a manner at the very best quite puerile. The style is vulgar, and the diction is as common as the content is disgusting.

For the Gospel and Traditions of Matthias cf. *Th. Zahn,* Gesch. des neutestamentl. Kanons, ii. 2, 751—761; *Harnack,* Gesch. der altchristl. Literatur, i. 17 f.; ii. 1, 595—598. For the Gospel of Philip cf. *Zahn,* l. c., ii. 2, 761—768; *Harnack,* l. c., i. 14 f.; ii. 1, 592 ff. The longer of the two Greek recensions of the Gospel of Thomas was edited by *J. A. Mingarelli,* in Nuova Raccolta d' opuscoli scientifici e filologici, Venezia, 1764, xii. 73—155; by *J. C. Thilo,* Codex apocryphus Novi Testamenti, Leipzig, 1832, i. 275—315 (cf. LXXII—XCI); by *C. Tischendorf,* Evangelia apocrypha (2. ed., Leipzig, 1876), pp. 140—157 (cf. XXXVI—XLVIII). *Tischendorf* (l. c., pp. 158—163) added a shorter Greek recension to the longer one and (pp. 164—180) a Latin *Tractatus de pueritia Jesu secundum Thomam. W. Wright* translated and published a Syriac version in Contributions to the Apocryphal Literature of the New Testament, London, 1865, pp. 11—16 for the Syriac, pp. 6—11 for the English text. For the Slavonic recensions cf. *Bonwetsch,* in *Harnack,* l. c., i. 910. A German version of the longer Greek recension in *Thilo* is found in *K. Fr. Borberg,* Bibliothek der neutestamentl. Apokryphen, Stuttgart, 1841, i. 57—84; *L. Conrady,* Das Thomasevangelium, in Theol. Studien und Kritiken (1903), lxxvi. 378—459. For the Gospel of Thomas cf. *Zahn,* l. c., ii. 2, 768—773; *Harnack,* l. c., i. 15—17; ii. 1, 593—595. *E. Kuhn* attempted, unsuccessfully, to prove the Buddhistic origin of the stories in the Gospel of St. Thomas concerning the marvellous knowledge shown in the village school by the Divine Child [1]. Festgabe zum fünfzigjährigen Doktorjubiläum of A. Weber, Leipzig, 1896, pp. 116—119.

7. THE PROTEVANGELIUM JACOBI. A much better impression is created by the so-called Protevangelium Jacobi, which gives an account of the life of the Blessed Virgin until the Slaughter of the Innocents at Bethlehem. The names of her parents are here given for the first time as Joachim and Anna. The diction is chaster, the whole tone of the narrative more noble, and the contents more interesting and important than in most other apocrypha. The author calls himself «Jacobus», and his book a «History» (*ἱστορία,* c. 25,1). The title of Protevangelium *(πρωτευαγγέλιον)*, i. e. *primum evangelium,* was given the work by G. Postel († 1581). There are difficulties in the way of admitting a single authorship for the text as found in the manuscripts. In the narrative of the birth of the Lord (cc. 18, 2; 19, 1 2) there is no introduction, and Joseph appears suddenly on the scene speaking in the first person. The closing chapters (22—24),

[1] Cf. cc. 6 and 14 of the longer Greek recension, and *Iren.,* Adv. haer., i. 20, 1.

in which are related the persecution of John the Baptist on the occasion of the Slaughter of the Innocents, and the execution of his father Zacharias by order of Herod, seem to be later additions. The first express mention of the work (at least of its original nucleus) is by Origen[1], but traces of it are found with sufficient certainty in the writings of Justin[2]. Its composition is, therefore, generally referred to the first decades of the second century. The author was certainly a Judæo-Christian, not from Palestine, perhaps, but from Egypt or Asia Minor. There is no sufficient foundation for the hypothesis of Conrady that the Greek text is a translation of a Hebrew original. In so far as it deals with biblical material, the Gospel is based on the narratives of Matthew and Luke; the features relative to the time before the espousals of Joseph and Mary tend to glorify the Mother of God, but have no historical value. The edifying tendency of the book is responsible for its wide diffusion and the great influence it has exercised.

The *editio princeps* of the Greek text is that of *M. Neander*, Basle, 1564. The best editions are those of *Thilo*, Codex apocr. Novi Test., Leipzig, 1832, i. 159—273 (cf. XLV—LXXII), and *Tischendorf*, Evang. apocr. (2. ed., Leipzig, 1876), pp. 1—50 (cf. XII—XXII). In a work entitled An Alexandrian Erotic Fragment and other Greek Papyri, chiefly Ptolemaic, Oxford, 1896, pp. 13—19, *B. P. Grenfell* published a fifth- or sixth-century papyrus fragment (cc. 7, 2—10, 1), of the Protevangelium. A fragment of a Syriac version (cc. 17—25), with an English translation, is found in *Wright*, Contributions to the Apocryphal Literature of the New Testament, London, 1865. — The Protevangelium Jacobi and Transitus Mariae, with texts from the Septuagint, the Coran, the Peschitto and from a Syriac hymn in a Syro-Arabic palimpsest of the fifth and other centuries, edited and translated by *A. Smith Lewis*, Cambridge, 1902 (Studia Sinaitica, n. XI). *E. Nestle*, Ein syrisches Bruchstück aus dem Protoevangelium Jacobi, in Zeitschr. für die neutestamentl. Wissensch. (1902), iii. 86—87. In the American Journal of Theology (1897), i. 424—442, *F. C. Conybeare* made known an Armenian version, and translated it into English. For the Slavonic versions cf. *N. Bonwetsch*, in *Harnack*, Gesch. der altchristl. Literatur, i. 909 ff.; for Coptic and Arabic versions *Thilo*, l. c., Proleg. pp. LXVII ff. There are German versions by *Borberg* (after *Thilo*), Bibliothek der neutestamentl. Apokryphen (Stuttgart, 1841), i. 9—56, and by *F A. v. Lehner* (after *Tischendorf*), Die Marienverehrung in den ersten Jahrhunderten (2. ed., Stuttgart, 1886), pp. 223—236. *L. Conrady*, Das Protevangelium Jacobi in neuer Beleuchtung, in Theol. Studien und Kritiken (1889), lxii. 728—784. *Zahn*, Gesch. des neutestamentl. Kanons, ii. 2, 774—780. *Id.*, Retractiones, iv, in Neue kirchl. Zeitschr. (1902), xiii. 19—22. *Harnack*, l. c., ii. 1, 598—603.

8. THE GOSPELS OF ANDREW, BARNABAS, AND BARTHOLOMEW. In the so-called Decretal of Gelasius, *De recipiendis et non recipiendis libris*, we meet with the titles of Apocryphal Gospels: *nomine Andreae, nomine Barnabae, nomine Bartholomaei.* Probably under the

[1] Comm. in Matth., x. 17: ἡ βίβλος Ἰακώβου.

[2] Dial. c. Tryph., cc. 78, 100; Apol., i. 33.

name of Gospel of Andrew are meant the Acts of St. Andrew (§ 30, 6) mentioned by Pope Innocent I.[1] and by St. Augustine[2]. No Gospel of Barnabas is mentioned in ancient ecclesiastical literature; at a later period we meet with but one mention of it in the (Greek) Catalogue of the Sixty Canonical Books. A Gospel of Bartholomew is spoken of by St. Jerome[3], but no more precise knowledge of it has reached us.

The Catalogue of the Sixty Canonical Books has been lately edited anew by *Zahn,* Gesch. des neutestamentl. Kanons, ii. 1, 289—293. A fragment of the Gospel of Bartholomew is said to exist in a codex of the Vatican Library: *A. Mai,* Nova Patr. Bibl., Rome, 1854, vii. 3, 117 IV *E. A. Axon,* On the Mahommedan Gospel of Barnabas, in Journal of Theol. Studies (1902), iii. 441—453.

9. ORIGINS OF THE PILATE-LITERATURE. Apropos of the miracles of the Lord and His crucifixion, Justin Martyr refers the Roman Emperors to the Acts of the trial under Pilate *(τὰ ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου γενόμενα ἄκτα)*[4]. It is probable that he had not in mind any published document current under that title, but took it for granted that the acts of the trial of Jesus were to be found in the imperial archives at Rome. The extant *Acta* or *Gesta Pilati,* or *Evangelium Nicodemi,* relate the interrogatory before Pilate, the condemnation, crucifixion, and resurrection of Jesus. They are of Christian origin, and are not older than the fourth century Tertullian mentions[5] a report of Pilate to Tiberius on the death and resurrection of our Lord. The Letter of Pilate to Emperor Claudius, in the Acts of Peter and Paul (§ 30, 4), might be a revision of of this report; it is, in any case, of Christian origin.

*R. A. Lipsius,* Die Pilatusakten kritisch untersucht, Kiel, 1871. *H. v. Schubert,* Die Komposition des pseudo-petrinischen Evangelienfragments, Berlin. 1893, pp. 175 ff. *Harnack,* Gesch. der altchristl. Literatur, ii. 1, 603 ff. The Anaphora Pilati etc., in Syriac and Arabic, Studia Sinaitica (1890), v. 15—66, with English translation, 1—14. *E. v. Dobschütz,* Der Prozeß Jesu nach den Acta Pilati, in Zeitschr. für die neutestamentl. Wissensch. (1902), iii. 89 114. *G. F. Abbott,* The Report and Death of Pilate, in Journal of Theol. Studies (1902), iv. 83—88. *Th. Mommsen,* Die Pilatusakten, in Zeitschr. f. neutest. Wissenschaft (1902), iii. 198—205. *T H. Bindley,* Pontius Pilate in the Creed, in Journal of Theol. Studies (1904), vi. 112—113.

## § 30. Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles.

1. THE PREACHING OF PETER AND THE PREACHING OF PAUL. Clement of Alexandria cites frequently[6] a «Preaching of Peter» *(Πέτρου κήρυγμα),* and treats it as a trustworthy source of teaching of the prince of the Apostles. Similarly we learn from Origen[7] that the

[1] Ep. 6 ad Exsup., c. 7.
[2] Contra adv. leg. et proph., i. 20, 39.
[3] Comm. in Matth., prol.
[4] Apol., i. 35, 48; cf. c. 38.
[5] Apol., c. 21; cf. c. 5.
[6] Strom., i. 29, 182; ii. 15, 68, etc.
[7] Comm. in Joan., xiii. 17.

Gnostic Heracleon (ca. 160—170) invoked the authority of this work. Origen himself doubts (l. c.) its authenticity, and Eusebius rejects it quite decidedly as an apocryphal writing[1] Nevertheless, it found acceptance as late as the time of John of Damascus; for the «Teaching of Peter» *(Πέτρου διδασκαλία)* that is quoted by him[2], is very probably the same as the «Preaching of Peter»[3] The lost original probably contained no continuous didactic exposition but a series of discourses pretending to be the work of Peter; both *κήρυγμα* and *διδασκαλία* usually indicate teaching of a collective character. The meagre fragments that have reached us treat of the mission of the twelve Apostles by the Lord, of the true, i. e. the Christian adoration of God, and show no traces of heretical teaching. It was probably composed between 100 and 125 (cf. § 15), perhaps by reason of a misunderstanding of II Pet. i. 15. — The only mention of a «Preaching of Paul» (Pauli praedicatio) is in the pseudo-Cyprianic writing *De rebaptismate* (c. 17); very probably, however, it is the «Acts of Paul» that are quoted (see p. 100). There seems to be no sufficient reason for the hypothesis of Hilgenfeld, according to which the Preaching of Peter and the Preaching of Paul were originally one work under the title *Πέτρου καὶ Παύλου κήρυγμα.*

Extant fragments of these works are collected and put in order by *A. Hilgenfeld,* in his Nov. Test. extra can. rec. (2. ed., Leipzig, 1884), iv. 51—65; for the fragment of the κήρυγμα Πέτρου cf. also *Preuschen,* Antilegomena, Gießen, 1901, pp. 52—54. The single fragments are discussed in much detail by *E. von Dobschütz,* Das Kerygma Petri kritisch untersucht, Leipzig, 1893 (Texte und Untersuchungen, xi. 1). Cf. *Hilgenfeld,* in Zeitschr. für wissenschaftl. Theol. (1893), ii. 518—541, and *Zahn,* Gesch. des neutestamentl. Kanons (1892), ii. 2, 820—832, 881—885. Apart from their title, the Πέτρου κηρύγματα, that pretend to be the basis of the Clementines (cf. § 26, 3), have nothing to do with the above-mentioned text. The «Doctrine of Simon Cephas in the City of Rome», a Syriac text of which was published by *W. Cureton,* Ancient Syriac Documents, London, 1864, pp. 35—41, is not older than the latter half of the fourth century. Cf. *Lipsius,* Die apokryphen Apostelgeschichten und Apostellegenden (1887), ii. 1, 206 sq. — *A. Smith Lewis,* The mythological Acts of the Apostles translated from an Arabic manuscript in the Convent of Deyr-es-Suriani, Egypt, and from mss. in the Convent of St. Catherine of Mount Sinai, and in the Vatican Library With a translation of the palimpsest fragments of the Acts of Judas Thomas from Cod. Sin. Syr. (Horae Semiticae, iii. iv [London, 1904] xlvi, 265; viii, 228 pp.). *J. G. Tasker,* Mythological Acts of the Apostles, in Expository Times (1904), pp. 110—111.

2. THE ACTS OF PETER. In their original form the Acts *(πράξεις)* of Peter are an extended Gnostic narrative of the doings and sufferings of the prince of the Apostles, composed shortly after the middle of the second century; the story has reached us in a respect-

[1] Hist. eccl., iii. 3, 2; cf. *Hier.,* De viris illustr., c. 1.
[2] Sacra Parallela: *Migne,* PG., xcv. 1157, 1461.
[3] Cf. *Orig.,* De princ. praef. n. 8: Petri doctrina.

able number of fragments. The account of the martyrdom of the Apostle, which certainly formed the conclusion of the work, is extant in the original Greek *(μαρτύριον τοῦ ἁγίου ἀποστόλου Πέτρου)* and in a rhetorically enlarged Latin version *(Martyrium Beati Petri a Lino episcopo conscriptum)*: there can be no doubt that in this inscription it is Linus, the first successor of Peter, who is meant. A revised text is also found in Old-Slavonic, Coptic (Sahidic), Arabic, and Ethiopic. Of the two Greek codices hitherto known, one has preserved, together with the account of the martyrdom, a small fragment of the preceding narrative. A larger fragment is attached to the martyrdom in a rudely-executed Latin version known as *Actus Petri cum Simone*. This text, as just said, represents the most important of the extant fragments of the ancient Acts of Peter. In it are told the labours of St. Peter at Rome, his triumph over Simon Magus in the performance of miracles, the wretched end of the magician in consequence of his attempted flight to heaven, and at great length the glorious martyrdom of the Apostle who was crucified head downward. That it is a work of Gnostic origin and nature is plain from its Docetism, its prohibition of sexual intercourse even among married persons, and its celebration of the Eucharist with bread and water. The first certain evidence of it is in Commodian[1], though the actual title is first mentioned by Eusebius[2] who says that it was an heretical work. According to Lipsius and Zahn it was written about 160—170, and by the author of the Acts of John (see p. 105), if similarity of ideas and diction are enough to prove the identity of authorship. Pope Innocent I. (401—417) declared[3] that the afore-mentioned Leucius (cf. § 28, 3) was the author of both the Acts of Peter and the Acts of John.

The fragments of the Acts of Peter are found in Acta apostolorum apocrypha, edd. *R. A. Lipsius* et *M. Bonnet,* part I, Leipzig, 1891. In this work were first published from a Cod. Vercellensis (saec. vii) the *Actus Petri cum Simone,* pp. 45—103. *Lipsius* had already published, in Jahrbücher für prot. Theol. (1886), xii. 86 ff. (cf. p. 175 ff.), the μαρτύριον τοῦ ἁγίου ἀποστόλου Πέτρου that is found, pp. 78—102, in *Lipsius* and *Bonnet;* cf. ib., proleg., pp. XIV ff., for an account of some earlier unserviceable editions of the *Martyrium Beati Petri apostoli a Lino episcopo conscriptum,* pp. 1—22. For the Old-Slavonic, Coptic, Arabic, and Ethiopic versions of the martyrdom, cf. *Lipsius* and *Bonnet,* proleg., pp. LIV. ff. We have already mentioned (§ 25, 3) a Coptic Πρᾶξις Πέτρου of Gnostic origin.

An Armenian version of the martyrdom of Peter was published by *P. Vetter,* Die armenischen apokryphen Apostelakten, i. Das gnostische Martyrium Petri, in Oriens christianus (1901), i. 217—239. The Acts of Peter are more fully treated by *Lipsius,* Die apokryphen Apostelgeschichten und Apostellegenden (1887), ii. 1, 85—284, and in the supplement (1890),

[1] Carm. apolog. 626, ed. *Dombart.*

[2] Hist. eccl., iii. 3, 2; cf. *Hier.,* De viris illustr., c. 1.

[3] Ep. 6 ad Exsup., c. 7.

pp. 34—47 *Zahn*, Gesch. des neutestamentl. Kanons, ii. 2, 832—855. *J. Franko*, Beiträge aus dem Kirchenslavischen zu den Apokryphen des Neuen Testaments, ii: Zu den gnostischen περίοδοι Πέτρου, in Zeitschr. für die neutestamentl. Wissensch. (1902), iii. 315—335. *A. Baumstark*, Die Petrus- und Paulusakten in der literarischen Überlieferung der syrischen Kirche, Leipzig, 1902, and *P. Peeters*, in Analecta Bolland. (1902), xxi. 121—140. *A. Hilgenfeld*, Die alten Actus Petri, in Zeitschr. für wissenschaftl. Theol. (1903), xlvi. 322—341. *K. Schmidt*, Die alten Petrusakten im Zusammenhang der apokryphen Apostelliteratur, nebst einem neuentdeckten Fragment untersucht, in Texte und Untersuchungen, new series, ix. 1. *G. Ficker*, Die Petrusakten, Beiträge zu ihrem Verständnis, Leipzig, 1904. It is strange that *Harnack* (Gesch. der altchristl. Literatur, ii. 1, 449 f.) should reject the Gnostic origin and tendency of the Acts of Peter, and refer them to the middle of the third century. *James*, on the other hand, has lately defended the identity of the author of the Acts of Peter with the second century writer of the Acts of John. Cf. Apocrypha Anecdota, 2. series (Cambridge, 1897), pp. XXIV ff.; also *Harnack*, Texte und Untersuchungen, new series (1900), v. 3, 100—106.

3. THE ACTS OF PAUL. About the time (160—170) of the publication of the Gnostic Acts of Peter, Catholic Acts *(πράξεις)* of Paul were put in circulation. Eusebius[1] places them among the *ἀντιλεγόμενα* of the New Testament; Origen[2] cites them twice in a friendly and approving way; Hippolytus[3] treats them, without specific mention of their title, as a well-known and accepted historical book. It is very probable that the Preaching of Paul mentioned in the *De rebaptismate* (see p. 98) is none other than these Acts of Paul. In the so-called *Catalogus Claromontanus*, an index of the biblical books made about 300, the length of these Acts is put down as 3560 verses or lines. In the Stichometria attributed to Nicephorus, patriarch of Constantinople (806—815), they are set down as containing 3600 lines. It is only lately that more light has been thrown on such high figures by the discovery that the Acts of Paul and Thecla (see p. 102) and the apocryphal Correspondence of Paul and the Corinthians (§ 31, 3) are in reality parts of the original Acts of Paul, although at a very early date these two sections took on an independent form. The proof of this was furnished in 1897 by Schmidt's discovery at Heidelberg, in a papyrus-roll, of fragments of a Coptic version of the Acts of Paul. Confirmation was soon forthcoming from the so-called *Caena Cypriani*, a biblical cento, probably of the fifth century, for the composition of which, as Harnack saw (1899), not only were the biblical writings used, but also the Acts of Paul in their complete form. Besides these two larger sections of the Acts of Paul, there has also been preserved the conclusion of this lengthy work, its martyrdom-narrative, both in the Greek original *(μαρτύριον τοῦ ἁγίου ἀποστόλου Παύλου)* and in

[1] Hist. eccl., iii. 3, 5; 25, 4.

[2] Comm. in Joan., xx. 12; De princ., i. 2, 3.

[3] Comm. in Dan., iii. 29, 4, ed. *Bonwetsch*.

several translations: Latin, Slavonic, Coptic (Sahidic), Arabic, Ethiopic. Hitherto only fragments of the Latin translation, in its original form, have been recognized and published; its complete text has reached us in a later recension. In the more recent manuscripts of this text it is ascribed to Pope Linus (see p. 99), while the earlier manuscripts present it as an anonymous work: *Passio Sancti Pauli apostoli.* According to this narrative Paul preached at Rome with great success concerning the Eternal King, Jesus Christ, and thereby irritated Nero who issued edicts of persecution against the «soldiers of the Great King» By the Emperor's order Paul was beheaded. That these Acts were of Catholic origin is proven by the evidence of those who first mention them: Hippolytus, Origen, and Eusebius. Moreover no traces of heresy, especially of Gnosticism, have been found in the extant fragments.

For the Greek and the two Latin texts of the martyrdom of Paul, cf. *Lipsius,* in Acta apost. apocr., edd. *Lipsius* et *Bonnet,* part i, 1891; *Lipsius* had already made known the Greek text (ib. 104—117) and the earlier Latin text (ib. 105—113) *(passionis Pauli fragmentum),* in Jahrbücher für prot. Theol. (1886), xii. 86 ff. (cf. 175 ff.) and 334 sq. (cf. 691 ff.).

The later Latin text (*Lipsius* and *Bonnet,* 23—44) was already well-known; cf. *Lipsius,* proleg., pp. XIV ff., and ib., pp. LVI ff.. for the Slavonic, Coptic, Arabic, and Ethiopic versions. The Acts of Paul are discussed in detail by *Lipsius,* Die apokryphen Apostelgeschichten und Apostellegenden, ii. 1, 85—284, and in the Supplement, pp. 34—47. *Zahn,* Gesch. des neutestament. Kanons, ii. 2, 865—891. On the original form and the remnants of the Acts of Paul cf. *C. Schmidt,* in Neue Heidelberger Jahrbücher (1897), vii. 117—124; *Harnack,* in Texte und Untersuchungen, xix, new series (1899), iv. 3 b; *P Corssen,* Die Urgestalt der Paulusakten, in Zeitschr. für die neutestamentl. Wissensch. (1903), iv. 22—47; *C. Schmidt,* Acta Pauli, aus der Heidelberger koptischen Papyrus-Handschrift, n. 1, Übersetzung, Untersuchungen und koptischer Text, Leipzig, 1904, LVI, 240, 80 pp. A photographic facsimile of the Coptic text was published by *Schmidt* (ib., 1904). See *Shahan,* Cath. Univ. Bulletin (Washington, 1905), x. 484—488.

4. THE ACTS OF PETER AND PAUL. The origin of these Acts is very obscure. Unlike the two preceding, they contain the later history of both the Apostles and tend to show a close homogeneity and a continuous concord between the two Apostles. Lipsius believes that they also were composed in the second century. There are, however, only very obscure traces of them before the fifth century, in Hippolytus[1], Cyril of Jerusalem[2], Asterius of Amasea[3], and Sulpicius Severus[4]. The work was surely of Catholic origin, and probably compiled with the purpose of withdrawing from the hands of the faithful the heretical Acts of Peter (see p. 98). All extant fragments show evidence of a later revision. The Greek texts, usually entitled

[1] Philos., vi. 20. [2] Catech. 6, c. 15.
[3] Hom. 8 in SS. Apost. Petr. et Paul., sub fine; cf. *Migne,* PG., xl. 297 ff.
[4] Chron. ii. 28.

*πράξεις τῶν ἁγίων ἀποστόλων Πέτρου καὶ Παύλου*, relate the journey of St. Paul to Rome and the martyrdom of both Apostles. One Greek codex (Marcianus, saec. xvi) relates only the martyrdom (*μαρτύριον τῶν ἁγίων ἀποστόλων Πέτρου καὶ Παύλου*), and is silent as to the Roman journey; even in its account of the former it offers a text that differs much from the other Greek codices, while it presents a close affinity with an early Latin version, which also omits the journey to Rome and is likewise entitled *Passio sanctorum apostolorum Petri et Pauli*. There are extant also an Old-Slavonic and an Old Italian version. It seems certain that the basis of the journey-narrative is found in the story of St. Paul's journey from the island of Cauda to Rome described in the canonical Acts of the Apostles (cc. xxvii—xxviii). In its account of the martyrdom of the Apostles this work profited much by the similar narrative in the Acts of Peter.

The Greek text of the martyrdom of both Apostles and of the journey to Rome was edited by *J. C. Thilo,* in two programmes of the University of Halle, 1837—1838; by *C. Tischendorf,* in his Acta apostol. apocrypha, pp. 1—39; by *Lipsius,* in Acta apost. apocr., edd. *Lipsius* and *Bonnet,* i. 178—222. In addition Lipsius reprinted (ib., pp. 118—176) the second recension of the Greek text, minus the journey-narrative (codex Marcianus saec. xvi), also the early Latin version of the martyrdom (pp. 119—177), and a later Latin compilation on the martyrdom of the two Apostles (pp. 223—234). For the early-Slavonic and Italian versions cf. *ib.,* proleg. pp. LXXXIX ff., and *Lipsius,* Die apokryphen Apostelgeschichten und Apostellegenden, ii. 1, 284 to 390. Supplement, pp. 47—61. *P. Vetter,* Die armenischen apokryphen Apostelakten, ii. Die Akten der Apostel Petrus und Paulus, in Oriens Christianus (1903), pp. 16—55.

5. THE ACTS OF PAUL AND THECLA. These Acts have come to us down in their Greek text, likewise in several Latin translations and in Syriac, Armenian, Slavonic, and Arabic recensions. In the manuscripts the Greek text bears the title *πράξεις Παύλου καὶ Θέκλης*, also *μαρτύριον τῆς ἁγίας πρωτομάρτυρος θέκλης*, or the like. Jerome calls it *περίοδοι Pauli et Theclae*[1]. The object of the very simple and unpretending tale is the story of Thecla, a noble virgin of Iconium in Lycaonia. Fascinated by the preaching of St. Paul she resolves on abandoning her betrothed to serve God in the state of virginity For this decision she suffers many torments and persecutions. After her miraculous liberation she devotes herself to the preaching of the Gospel, with the consent and by the commission of the Apostle. There is probably an historical nucleus to the narrative — the conversion and martyrdom of a Thecla of Iconium, the portrait of St. Paul (c. 3), the meeting of Thecla with Queen Tryphaena (cc. 27 ff., 39 ff.). But the truth is overlaid with much that is fanciful; in general these Acts are a highly romantic work of imagination. The historical frame-

[1] De viris illustr., c. 7.

work of the narrative is furnished by the so-called first journey of St. Paul, described in the canonical Acts (cc. xiii—xiv), and many of the characters that figure in it are drawn from the Second Epistle to Timothy. Since the third and fourth centuries, the Thecla-legend, originally vouched for by these Acts of Paul and Thecla, spread widely throughout the whole Church. Tertullian relates[1] that they were composed by a priest of Asia Minor who was possessed by a fanatical admiration for St. Paul. For this action the priest was deposed from his office. Jerome repeats (l. c.) the statement of Tertullian, with the addition that the judgment of the priest took place in the presence of the Apostle John (apud Joannem), an assertion which is surely erroneous. It has been lately shown (see p. 100) that the Acts of Paul and Thecla are only a fragment of the Acts of Paul; hence they were composed about 160—170. It is quite credible that the Acts of Paul were written by a Catholic priest; he was punished, not so much because he put forth unecclesiastical doctrine, as because he gave currency to historical falsehoods.

The Greek text of the Acts of Paul and Thecla is found in *J. E. Grabe*, Spicilegium SS. Patrum ut et haereticorum, Oxford, 1698, i. 95—119 (and thence in *Gallandi*, Bibl. vet. Patr., Venice, 1765, i. 177—191); *Tischendorf*, Acta apost. apocr., pp. 40—63. *Lipsius*, Acta apost. apocr., edd. *Lipsius* et *Bonnet*, i. 235—272. There are in print three ancient Latin versions of the Acts, one in the collection of Legends of the Saints, published at Milan in 1476 by *B. Mombritius* (without title or pagination), a second in *Grabe* l. c., pp. 120—127 (*Gallandi* l. c.), the third in Bibliotheca Casinensis iii, (1877), Florileg. 271—276. *O. v. Gebhardt*, Passio S. Theclae virginis. Die lateinische Übersetzung der Acta Pauli et Theclae, nebst Fragmenten, Auszügen und Beilagen (Texte und Untersuchungen, new series, vii. 2), Leipzig, 1902. *W. Wright* published and translated the Syriac version of these Acts in his Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles, London, 1871, i. 127—169 (Syriac); ii. 116—145 (English). The Armenian version was translated into English by *F. C. Conybeare*, The Apology and Acts of Apollonius and other Monuments of Early Christianity, London, 1894; 2. ed. 1896. For a Slavonic and an Arabic translation of the Acts cf. *Lipsius* l. c., proleg., p. CII. *C. Schlau*, Die Akten des Paulus und der Thekla und die ältere Thekla-Legende, Leipzig, 1877 *Lipsius*, Die apokryphen Apostelgeschichten, ii. 1, 424—467; Supplement, pp. 61 sq. 104. *A. Rey*, Étude sur les Acta Pauli et Theclae et la légende de Thécla, Paris, 1890. *Zahn*, Gesch. des neutestamentl. Kanons, ii. 2, 892—910. *Harnack*, Gesch. der altchristl. Literatur, i. 136—138 (*Preuschen*); ii. 1, 493—505. *W. M. Ramsay*, The Church in the Roman Empire before A. D. 170, 2. ed., London, 1893, pp. 375—428. *Id.*, A Lost Chapter of Early Christian History (Acta Pauli et Theclae), in Expositor, 1902, pp. 278—295. Cf. *J. Gwynn*, Thecla, in Dict. of Christ. Biogr. (London, 1887), iv. 882—896.

6. THE ACTS OF ANDREW. Eusebius[2] is the first to mention Acts (*πράξεις*) of the Apostle Andrew, observing that they were used only by «heretics», Gnostics perhaps, or Manichæans according to other

[1] De bapt., c. 17. [2] Hist. eccl., iii. 25, 6.

writers[1]. The work was held in high esteem by the Priscillianists[2]. Pope Innocent I. says[3] that its authors were the «philosophers» Nexocharides (Xenocharides?) and Leonidas. Possibly he may have found this statement in the Acts themselves, though some have seen in these names a distortion of the name of Leucius Charinus (§ 28, 3). The Acts are certainly of Gnostic origin and were probably written in the latter half of the second century, according to Lipsius by the author of the Gnostic Acts of Peter (see p. 98) and the Gnostic Acts of John (see p. 105). Some fragments of the original Acts of Andrew have been preserved in citations and narratives of ecclesiastical writers, e. g. the story of a certain Maximilla related by Evodius of Uzalum[4], and the prayer of Andrew upon the Cross related by the pseudo-Augustine[5]. Lengthy fragments of this work, which was apparently an extensive one, have reached us in recensions executed by Catholic hands. Among the printed fragments is a Greek text entitled *πράξεις Ἀνδρέου καὶ Ματθεία εἰς τὴν πόλιν τῶν ἀνθρωποφάγων*. It is also found in several translations: Syriac, Coptic (Sahidic), Ethiopic, and Anglo-Saxon. Andrew frees miraculously his fellow-Apostle Matthias who was held in prison by the Anthropophagi. After suffering grievous torments he preaches the Gospel successfully to his captors. Here the narration breaks off quite abruptly, only to be resumed and carried on in a second Greek fragment entitled *πράξεις τῶν ἁγίων ἀποστόλων Πέτρου καὶ Ἀνδρέα*, preserved also in Slavonic and Ethiopic. Its subject is the happy issue soon vouchsafed to the mission of the two Apostles (at once companions and brothers) in the «city of the Barbarians» *(ἐν τῇ πόλει τῶν βαρβάρων)*. Both «Anthropophagi» and «Barbarians» are to be looked for about the shores of the Black Sea. The ancient Acts make Andrew go into Pontus from Greece (Philastr. l. c.) and narrate his death on the cross at Patræ in Achaia. His death is the theme of the *μαρτύριον τοῦ ἁγίου ἀποστόλου Ἀνδρέου*, which we possess both in a Greek and a Latin text. It pretends to be the work of his personal disciples and eye-witnesses of the facts, i. e. of «priests and deacons of the churches of Achaia», but is probably not older than the fifth century. Lipsius is of opinion that the Greek text is the original and the Latin a translation, but Bonnet is doubtless right in maintaining that the Latin is the original, and he distinguishes two Greek versions.

The «Acts of Andrew and Matthias in the City of the Anthropophagi» were edited in Greek by *Thilo,* in a program of the University of Halle in 1846, and by *Tischendorf,* in Acta apost. apocr., pp. 132—166; cf. the Appendix in *Tischendorf,* Apocalypses apocr., pp. 139—141. For the various

[1] *Epiph.*, Haer., 47, 1; 61, 1; 63, 2. *Philastr.*, De haeres., c. 88.
[2] *Turib.*, Ep. ad Idac. et Cepon., c. 5. [3] Ep. 6 ad Exsup., c. 7.
[4] De fide contra Manichaeos, c. 38.
[5] De vera et falsa poenitentia, c. 8, 22.

versions cf. *Lipsius*, Die apokryphen Apostelgeschichten, i. 546 ff., and Supplement, pp. 259 ff. The «Acts of the holy Apostles Peter and Andrew» were published in Greek by *Tischendorf*, Apocal. apocr., pp. 161—167. For the versions cf. *Lipsius*, l. c., i. 553. The «Martyrdom of the holy Apostle Andrew» was published in Greek by *C. Chr Woog*, Leipzig, 1749 (*Gallandi*, Bibl. vet. Patr., Venice, 1765, pp. 152—165), and by *Tischendorf*, Acta apost. apocr., pp. 105—131. An Italian version from the Greek was brought out by *M. Mallio*, Venice, 1797, and Milan, 1882. The Latin text of these Acts was already printed by *Mombritius* (see p. 103), in his Leggendario, and has since been often reprinted (cf. *Gallandi*, l. c.). All the aforenamed Greek and Latin texts, with some new pieces, including a long Greek fragment «Ex actis Andreae» (38—45) were edited by *Bonnet*, in the Acta apost. apocr. of *Lipsius* and *Bonnet* (1898), ii. 1, 1 to 127. In *Lipsius*, l. c., i, 545 ff., there is a discussion of more recent recensions of the legend of Andrew. Three works quoted by *Lipsius* from the manuscripts have since been published by *Bonnet*, in Analecta Bollandiana (1894), xiii. 309—378, and separately in Supplementum codicis apocryphi, Paris, 1895, ii; Acta Andreae cum laudatione contexta (Greek); Martyrium Andreae (Greek); Passio Andreae (Latin). For the Slavonic version of the Acts of Andrew cf. *M. N. Speranskij*, The Apocryphal Acts of the Apostle Andrew in the Old-Slavonic texts (Russian), Moscow, 1894. On the Acts of Andrew in general cf. *Lipsius*, l. c., i. 543—622, and Supplement, pp. 28—31.

7 THE ACTS OF JOHN. With the Acts of Andrew Eusebius couples[1] certain Acts *(πράξεις)* of the Apostle John, he also places them among the heretical works forbidden by the Church. Other writers say that both the Acts of John and the Acts of Andrew were in use among the Gnostices, Manichaeans, and Priscillianists[2]. Very probably the writer is identical with the author of the Acts of Peter (see p. 98), perhaps of those of Andrew (see p. 103). They are surely of Gnostic origin, and are as old as the second century; for Clement of Alexandria cites them[3] Their original text has been lost, but the substance of their contents has reached us through later Catholic recensions of the Johannine Legend. The principal subject of these Acts seems to have been the journey of John into Asia (Minor) and the miracles performed by him at Ephesus. They pass lightly over his (three years') exile in Patmos, are very diffuse as to the Apostle's second sojourn at Ephesus, and close with the story of the peaceful death of their hero. We really have little information about the Gnostic Acts of John. In the Acts of the Second Council of Nicæa (787) are preserved three genuine fragments of their original text. One of them refers to a portrait of St. John, and was quoted by the iconoclastic synod of Constantinople (754) against the veneration of images. The other two were quoted at the above mentioned Council of Nicæa as proof of the heretical origin

[1] Hist. eccl., iii. 25, 6.

[2] *Epiph.*, Haer. 47, 1. *Philastr.*, De haeres., c. 88. *Aug.*, Contra adv. legis et prophet., i. 20, 39. *Turib.*, Ep. ad Idac. et Cepon., c. 5.

[3] Adumbr. in 1 Io. i. 1.

and character of the Acts of John, the source of the pretended apostolic testimony. These latter excerpts are met with in a still longer fragment, first published by *James* under the title: «Wonderful Narration *(διήγησις θαυμαστή)* of the deeds and visions which the holy John the Theologian saw through our Lord Jesus Christ». It sets forth with insistency, and in a tasteless way, the doctrine of a merely docetic body in Jesus Christ. Other lengthy fragments may be attributed, with more or less probability, to the Gnostic Acts of St. Andrew, especially a narration of the death *(μετάστασις)* of the Apostle. It is extant in Greek, Syriac, Armenian, and other languages.

Collections of the fragments of the Gnostic Acts of John were made by *Thilo,* in a programme of the University of Halle 1847 Cf. *Zahn,* Acta Joannis, Erlangen, 1880, pp. 219—252 (LX—CLXXII); *Bonnet,* in Acta apost. apocr., edd. *Lipsius* et *Bonnet* (1898), ii. 1, 151—216. The fragment mentioned is edited by *James* in his Apocrypha Anecdota, 2. series, pp. 1—25; cf. IX—XXVIII. The greater part of the Acta Joannis in Zahn is taken up with a new edition of the Greek narrative of the deeds of the Apostle John, current under the name of Prochorus (cf. the canonical Acts, vi. 5), composed probably in the first half of the fifth century. For two Latin recensions of the Johannine legend that are much closer a kin to the Gnostic Acts than the Greek text is, see *Lipsius,* Die apokryphen Apostelgeschichten, i. 408—431. In his Monarchianische Prologe zu den vier Evangelien, Leipzig, 1896, pp. 73—91 (Texte und Untersuchungen, xv. 1), *P. Corssen* has constructed out of the writings of Jerome, Augustine, and others an *Historia ecclesiastica de Johanne apostolo et evangelista,* which he claims was current in the third century. It probably never existed, at least in the proposed shape. On the Acts of John in general cf. *Zahn* l. c., Einleitung, pp. III—CLXXII; *Lipsius* l. c., i. 348—542, and Supplement, pp. 25—28, also *Zahn,* in Neue kirchl. Zeitschr. (1899), x. 191—218.

8. THE ACTS OF THOMAS. The Acts *(πράξεις)* of the Apostle Thomas have been handed down in a better text and a more complete condition than any of the other Gnostic legendary histories of the Apostles. It is true that the original text is lost, but two of the Catholic recensions, in Greek and Syriac, date from a very early period, and present a relatively clear vision of the Gnostic framework common to all. The Syriac text was published by *Wright* in 1871, the Greek by *Bonnet* in 1883. The principal difference between them consists in the larger number of Gnostic features that have faded from the Syriac, but have been preserved in the Greek. The theme of the Acts is the missionary preaching of St. Thomas in India. The Greek text is divided into twelve Acts *(πράξεις)* that are followed by the martyrdom, while the Syriac has but eight Acts and the martyrdom; the contents are substantially identical, however, as Acts 7—8 in the Syriac correspond to Acts 8—12 in the Greek text. They are filled with many kinds of odd and vulgar miracles, and aim mostly at dissuading their readers from all sexual intercourse. Von Gutschmid has shown that the narrative contains both legendary and

historical traits. The Indian king Gundaphorus, for whom, in the second Act, Thomas builds a palace in heaven, is the Indo-Parthian king Gondophares, of the first century of the Christian era, otherwise known only by coins and inscriptions. The hypothesis of von Gutschmid that the entire Thomas-Legend is only a story of Buddhistic missionary preaching, worked over in a Christian sense, still remains a pure conjecture. Some poetical pieces scattered through the narrative deserve attention, notably an Ode to Sophia, said to have been sung by Thomas in Hebrew (i. e. Aramaic) at Andrapolis on the occasion of the wedding of the king's daugther (*Bonnet,* 8 ff.); also two solemn prayers said to have been uttered by Thomas when baptizing and when celebrating the Holy Eucharist (*Bonnet,* 20 36); finally a beautiful, but often very enigmatic and rather irrelevant, hymn on the fate of the soul. The latter is found only in the Syriac text (*Wright,* 274 ff.). All these poetical compositions are decidedly Gnostic in character, and were doubtlessly written in Syriac, perhaps by Bardesanes. It seems, therefore, certain that the Acts were not originally composed in Greek but in Syriac, and in the first half of the third century at Edessa, by some disciple of Bardesanes. We know already (see p. 87) from Ephraem Syrus (cf. § 28, 3) that the followers of Bardesanes were wont to circulate apocryphal Acts of the Apostles. The Thomas-Legend, therefore, found its readers in those circles which loved to read the Acts of Andrew and the Acts of John, i. e. among Gnostics, Manichaeans, and Priscillianists[1].

The Syriac text of the Acts was published with an English translation by *Wright,* Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles, i. 171—333; ii. 146—298. The Greek text was edited by *Bonnet,* Supplementum codicis apocryphi, i. 1—95. Some fragments of the Greek text were first edited by *Thilo,* Acta S. Thomae apostoli, Leipzig, 1823. A larger number appeared in *Tischendorf,* Acta apost. apocr., pp. 190—242, and in Apocalypses apocr., pp. 156—161. In Rhein. Museum für Philologie, new series (1864), xix. 161—183 (Kleine Schriften von A. v. Gutschmid, Leipzig, 1890, ii. 332—364) *A. von Gutschmid* discussed the facts of Indian history that are referred to in the Thomas-Legend. On King Gondophares in particular, cf. *A. von Sallet,* Die Nachfolger Alexanders des Großen in Baktrien und Indien, Berlin, 1879, pp. 157—166. On the metrical pieces in the Acts cf. *K. Macke,* in Theol. Quartalschr. (1874), lvi. 1—70. A separate edition of the Hymn on the Soul was prepared by *A. A. Bevan,* Cambridge, 1897, and printed in Texts and Studies, v 3. *M. Bonnet,* Le poème de l'âme, version grecque remaniée par Nicétas de Thessalonique, in Analecta Bollandiana (1901), xx. 159—164. For the Acts in general cf. *Lipsius,* Die apokryphen Apostelgeschichten, i. 225—347, and Supplement, pp. 23—25, also *Harnack,* Gesch. der altchristl. Literatur, ii. 1, 545—549. Later recensions of the Legend are treated by *Lipsius* l. c., i. 240 ff. *Bonnet* (l. c.) re-edited two later Latin forms of the Legend. *De miraculis B. Thomae apostoli* (pp. 96 to 132), very probably by Gregory of Tours, and *Passio S. Thomae apostoli*

[1] *Epiph.*, Haer., 47, 1; 61, 1; *Aug.*, Contra Faustum, xxii. 79, and *passim*. *Turib.*, Ep. ad Idac. et Cepon, c. 5.

(pp. 133—160). For a later Greek recension cf. *James,* Apocrypha anecdota, 2. series, pp. 27—45, and pp. XXXII—XLIV. *Bonnet* brought out the definitive edition. Acta Philippi et Acta Thomae, accedunt Acta Barnabae, etc., ed. *M. Bonnet,* Leipzig, 1903 (Acta apost. apocr., edd. *Lipsius* et *Bonnet,* ii. 2). *A. Mancini,* Per la critica degli «Acta apocrypha Thomae», in Atti della R. Accad. di scienze di Torino (1904), xxxix. 11—13.

9. THE ACTS OF PHILIP. The Acts of Philip are very seldom mentioned in antiquity. We meet them for the first time in the so-called Gelesian Decretal *De recipiendis et non recipiendis libris* under the title *Actus nomine Philippi apostoli apocryphi.* Of the original fifteen Acts of the Greek text *(περίοδοι Φιλίππου τοῦ ἀποστόλου)* we possess only fragments, the first nine and the fifteenth Act. The latter contains the martyrdom of the Apostle. The description they offer of the missionary travels of the Apostle is very obscure and confused. In the second Act, Philip reaches the «city of the Athenians called Hellas»; in the third Act he goes from Athens to Parthia, thence into the land of the «Candacii» and to Azotus. In the fifth, sixth, and seventh Acts we find him again in Hellas at Nicatera. In the eighth Act he goes to the land of the serpent-worshippers *(εἰς τὴν χώραν τῶν Ὀφιανῶν)*, i. e. to Hierapolis in Phrygia, where, in the fifteenth Act, he meets with death. There is in these Acts a confusion of the Apostle Philip with Philip the Deacon. The imaginary journey to the land of the Candacii, and the action of the Apostle at Azotus, are based on an ignorant misinterpretation of the canonical Acts (viii. 27, Queen Candace) and the sojourn of the Apostle Philip at Azotus (Acts viii. 40). A Syriac legend concerning the doings of the Apostle Philip distorts still more gravely the truth of these chapters, when it makes the Apostle preach in «the City of Carthage that is in Azotus». In the opinion of Lipsius we have in the Greek text of these Acts a Catholic revision of a lost Gnostic original composed during the third century. Zahn holds them to be original compositions, made, at the earliest, about the end of the fourth century.

The Greek text of the second and the fifteenth Acts of Philip are in *Tischendorf,* Acta apost. apocr., pp. 75—104. The first Act and the Acts 3—9 were edited by *P. Batiffol,* in Analecta Bollandiana (1890), ix. 204—249. In his Apocalypses apocr., pp. 141—156, *Tischendorf* published two later Greek recensions of the fifteenth Act (the martyrdom). Cf. *James,* Apocrypha anecdota, pp. 158—163. For the Syriac text of the Acts of Philip cf. *Wright,* Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles, i. 73—99; ii. 69—92. In general cf. *Lipsius,* Die apokryphen Apostelgeschichten, ii. 2, 1—53; and Supplement, pp. 64—73 94 260. *H. O. Stölten* and *Lipsius,* in Jahrbücher für prot. Theol. (1891), xvii. 149—160 459—473. *Zahn,* Forschungen zur Gesch. des neutestamentl. Kanons (1900), vi. 18—24.

10. THE ACTS OF MATTHEW. Of these Acts only the conclusion or martyrdom-narrative has reached us. At Myrne, the city of the Anthropophagi, Matthew closed his glorious career in the service of

the Gospel by a martyrdom of fire, at the order of King Fulbanus. During the martyrdom, and after the death of the Apostle, astounding miracles took place that shook the obstinacy even of the king, who was converted and became a bishop. Apparently, the narrative is only a fragment; Lipsius deems it the remnant of an old Gnostic tale concerning Matthew, revised in the third century by Catholics. However, both the date and the Gnostic origin of the legend are still doubtful. No ecclesiastical writer of antiquity mentions these Acts.

For the Greek text of the Martyrium of Matthew cf. *Tischendorf*, Acta apost. apocr., pp. 167—189. *Bonnet* has added an ancient Latin recension, in Acta apost. apocr., edd. *Lipsius* et *Bonnet* (1898), ii. 1, 217—262. In general cf. *Lipsius*, Die apokryphen Apostelgeschichten, ii. 2, 109—141, and Supplement, p. 76.

11. THE LEGEND OF THADDÆUS. The famous Thaddæus-Legend is deserving of mention, though its hero, Thaddæus or Addæus, was originally held to be one of the 70 or 72 disciples (Luke x. 1) and only at a later date was confounded with the Apostle (Judas) Thaddæus. The earliest form of the Legend appears in Eusebius[1], who avers that he found it in the archives of Edessa[2]. Some of the documents in these archives he copied word for word, and translated from Syriac into Greek[3]. They were the correspondence between Abgar, toparch of Edessa, and Jesus, together with an account of the mission of Thaddæus to Edessa. In his Letter to Jesus, Abgar (Abgar V Ukkama, or «the Black» ca. 13—50) begs the Lord to visit him in Edessa and cure his illness. But the Lord refuses, since He must accomplish His work in Palestine and ascend thence to Heaven. After that event, however, He will send one of His disciples who will free Abgar from his illness.

The narrative goes on to relate that, after the Ascension of the Lord, «Judas who was also called Thomas», sent Thaddæus, one of the seventy, to Edessa. Thaddæus cured the king and many other sick persons, and began to preach the Gospel to the people of Edessa. In 1876 a lengthy Syriac narrative was given to the public in which there was question of the conversion of Edessa to the Christian faith. It claims to have been composed by a certain Labubna and is entitled «Doctrine of the Apostle Addæus». Almost contemporaneously an Armenian version of the Syriac original was published. In this work the documents cited by Eusebius re-appear in almost verbal agreement, the only difference being some minor additions. According to the newly discovered work the answer of the Lord to Abgar was not given in writing, but orally Moreover, before mentioning the mission to Edessa of Addæus, one of the Seventy-Two, this work interpolates a short account of the portrait of Christ said to have been painted

[1] Hist eccl., i. 13. [2] Ib., i. 13, 5; cf. ii. 1, 6. 8.
[3] Ib., i. 13, 5 22.

by Ananias, the messenger of Abgar. Finally, there is added a lengthy narrative of the missionary preaching of Addæus in Edessa. The short Greek Acts of Thaddæus, certainly not written before the fifth century, insert Thaddæus or Lebbæus (one of the Twelve), instead of Thaddæus or Addæus (one of the Seventy or Seventy-Two). It is not true, as Zahn (1881) contended, that the *Doctrina Addaei* represents the complete text of the *Acta Edessena* quoted by Eusebius. It is rather a later enlargement and improvement of that legend. According to Tixeront (1888), in its present form it cannot be earlier than 390—430. At the same time, it is not possible to fix more exactly the date of the *Acta Edessena*. Lipsius believes that the legend of the correspondence between Abgar and Jesus arose about the time of the first known Christian king of Edessa, Abgar VIII. (Bar Manu), ca. 176—213. There is no doubt of the non-authenticity of the correspondence. A sufficient refutation of its claims is the statement of St. Augustine that genuine Letters of Christ would have surely been most highly esteemed from the beginning in the Church of Christ [1]. It was the contrary that happened, for this very correspondence was declared apocryphal in the so-called Gelasian Decretal *De recip. et non recip. libris* [2].

*W. Cureton* published extensive fragments of the Syriac Doctrina Addaei, in Ancient Syriac Documents, London, 1864, pp. 5 (6)—23. Later *G. Phillips* edited the complete text: The Doctrine of Addai the Apostle, London, 1876. Editions of the Armenian version appeared, 1868, at Venice and at Jerusalem. For the Armenian version cf. *A. Carrière,* La légende d'Abgar dans l'histoire d'Arménie de Moïse de Khoren, Paris, 1895. For the Greek Acta Thaddaei cf. *Tischendorf,* Acta apost. apocr., pp. 261—265, and *Lipsius,* Acta apost. apocr., edd. *Lipsius* and *Bonnet,* 1, 273—278; Acta Thaddaei, in Giornale Arcadico iv. (1901), vol. vii, 55—63. *R. A. Lipsius,* Die edessenische Abgarsage kritisch untersucht, Braunschweig, 1880. *Id.,* Die apokryphen Apostelgeschichten, ii. 2, 178—200; Supplement, pp. 105—108. *Th. Zahn,* Forschungen zur Gesch. des neutestamentl. Kanons, Erlangen, 1881, i. 350—382. *W. A. Wright,* Abgar, in Dict. of Christian Biogr., London, 1877, i. 5—7. *K. C. A. Matthes,* Die edessenische Abgarsage auf ihre Fortbildung untersucht (Dissert. inaug.), Leipzig, 1882. *L. J. Tixeront,* Les origines de l'église d'Édesse et la légende d'Abgar, Paris, 1888. *A. Buffa,* La légende d'Abgar et les origines de l'église d'Édesse (Thèse), Geneva, 1893. *J. Nirschl,* Der Briefwechsel des Königs Abgar von Edessa mit Jesus in Jerusalem oder die Abgarfrage, in Katholik (1896), ii. 17 ff. 97 ff. 193 ff. 322 ff. 398 ff. *E. v. Dobschütz,* Christusbilder, Leipzig, 1899 (Texte und Untersuchungen, xviii, new series, iii), pp. 102 ff. 158 ff. 29 ff. *Id.,* in Zeitschr. für wissenschaftl. Theol. (1900), xliii. 422—486.

### § 31. Apocryphal Letters of the Apostles.

1. THE LETTER TO THE LAODICEANS. The reference of St. Paul (Col. iv. 16) to an epistle written by him to the Laodiceans has

[1] Contra Faust. Man. xviii, 4; cf. De cons. evang., i. 7, 11 ff.

[2] Epistola Jesu ad Abgarum regem apocrypha, Epistola Abgari ad Jesum apocrypha.

been variously interpreted in the past. It furnished the occasion for the forgery of a so-called Epistle of St. Paul, *Ad Laodicenses,* which from the sixth to the fifteenth century found welcome in many Latin biblical manuscripts. The Latin text exhibits a very inelegant and obscure diction and seems to be a translation from the Greek, although all the other texts of the Epistle discovered up to the present are derived from the Latin. This curious little Letter is entirely composed of words and phrases excerpted from the genuine Epistles of St. Paul, and impresses the reader as a very childish and harmless composition, without the slightest trace of heretical doctrine. The first certain mention of it is in a quotation from a work falsely attributed to St. Augustine, composed, however, very probably, in the fifth century[1] Possibly it is the same as the *Epistola ad Laodicenses* mentioned by St. Jerome[2], in which case our Epistle would date from the fourth century at least. An *Epistola ad Laudicenses,* mentioned in the Muratorian Fragment as a forgery in the interest of Marcion, was probably the canonical Epistle to the Ephesians revised by Marcion for the purpose of his teaching, and entitled *Ad Laodicenos*[3].

Cf. *R. Anger,* Über den Laodicenerbrief (Beiträge zur hist.-krit. Einleitung in das Alte und Neue Testament, i), Leipzig, 1843. *J. B. Lightfoot,* St. Paul's Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon, 2. ed., London, 1876, pp. 281—300. *Th. Zahn,* Gesch. des neutestamentl. Kanons (1892), ii. 2, 566—585. *Anger, Lightfoot* and *Zahn* exhibit also new recensions of the text. *Anger* makes known (pp. 166 ff.) two Old-German and two Old-English versions, also one Old-Bohemian version, and a re-translation from the Latin into the Greek. *Lightfoot* gives two Old-English translations into Greek. *Carra de Vaux* published an Arabic translation, in the Revue Biblique (1896), v. 221—226.

2. THE LETTER TO THE ALEXANDRINES. In the Muratorian Fragment the title of the last mentioned document is followed by that of a pseudo-Pauline and Marcionite Epistle *Ad Alexandrinos.* We have no other knowledge of this Letter which some have erroneously supposed to be the canonical Epistle to the Hebrews. A lesson of the seventh-century *Sacramentarium et Lectionarium Bobbiense,* entitled *Epistola Pauli apostoli ad Colos.,* would be, in the opinion of Zahn, a fragment of the *Epistola ad Alexandrinos.* But his hypothesis is over-bold, and very questionable.

*Zahn,* Gesch. des neutestamentl. Kanons, ii. 2, 586—592. *Harnack,* Gesch. der altchristl. Literatur, i. 33.

3. THE CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN PAUL AND THE CORINTHIANS. In the Syriac biblical manuscripts of the fourth century the two canonical Epistles of Paul to the Corinthians were followed by a third. A letter of the presbyters of Corinth to Paul served as an introduction to this latter Epistle. In his commentary on the Pauline Epistles Ephraem

[1] Liber de divinis scripturis (ed. *Weihrich,* p. 516).
[2] De viris illustr., c. 5. [3] *Tert.,* Adv. Marc., v. 11, 17.

Syrus treats this third Epistle, with its introductory note, as quite equal in authority to the genuine ones. In the fifth century it was translated from Syriac into Armenian and into Latin, and for centuries held its place in the biblical manuscripts of the Armenian Church. One Armenian and two Latin versions are extant; the Syriac text has not yet been discovered. Zahn and Vetter conjectured that the Syrian text must have been a translation or a recension of a Greek text that was itself only a part of the apocryphal Acta Pauli; their conjecture was destined to be borne out by the discovery mentioned in § 30, 3. The contents of the correspondence are as follows: Stephen and his co-presbyters at Corinth make known to Paul that two men, Simon and Cleobius, had been preaching at Corinth false doctrines; they denied the divine creation of the world and of man, the divine mission of the prophets, the virginal birth of Jesus, and the resurrection of the body. Their deceitful and perilous discourses had shaken severely the faith of some Christians. In the Armenian text (but not in the Latin) there is here inserted a document by which it appears that Paul was a prisoner at Philippi when he received the letter of the Corinthians, and that he was greatly troubled thereby. In his reply he insists again and urgently on the doctrine which he had always preached to the Corinthians, more particularly on that of the resurrection of the body. The idea of such a correspondence seems to have been suggested by 1 Cor. vii. 1 and v. 9.

On the subject of this correspondence there are two exhaustive monographs: *W Fr. Rinck*, Das Sendschreiben der Korinther an den Apostel Paulus und das dritte Sendschreiben Pauli an die Korinther, Heidelberg, 1823, and *P. Vetter*, Der apokryphe dritte Korintherbrief, Vienna, 1894. *Rinck* made a German translation of the Letters from eight Armenian manuscripts, and pursued at great length the history of their diffusion and of their use, in the strange hope of proving them to be genuine. *Vetter* gives a literary-historical introduction to the problem and presents a new edition of all hitherto known texts; he also makes some additions to them. The Armenian text (with a German version, in *Vetter*, pp. 39—57) was first published in 1715 by *D. Wilkins*. Of the two Latin translations one (*Vetter*, pp. 58—64) was edited by *S. Berger* (1891), and the other (*Vetter*, pp. 64—69) by *E. Bratke* (1892). *Vetter* gives (pp. 70—79) a German version of the Commentary of Ephraem Syrus (in Old-Armenian) on these Epistles; the original Syriac has been lost. Cf. *Zahn*, Gesch. des neutestamentl. Kanons, ii. 2, 592—611, 1016—1019; *Vetter*, in Theol. Quartalschr. (1895), lxxvii. 622—633; *A. Berendts*, in Abhandlungen Al. von Öttingen gewidmet, München, 1898, pp. 1—28.

4. THE CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN PAUL AND SENECA. There is extant in Latin a Correspondence between Paul and Seneca, made up of eight short Letters of the Roman philosopher *L. Annaeus Seneca* († 65) and six, mostly still shorter, replies of the Apostle. They are remarkable for poverty of thought and content, rude diction and unpolished style. Seneca admires (Ep. i. 7) the Epistles of Paul, but

is offended at the antithesis between their noble contents and the wretched style (Ep. 7); he advises him to pay more attention to expression and to acquire a better Latin diction (Ep. 13; cf. Ep. 9). This correspondence is first mentioned by Jerome[1] and probably was not extant before the fourth century. There is no foundation for the hypothesis that the correspondence mentioned by Jerome has disappeared, while the extant Letters are mediæval fiction; the Latin text is original, not a translation. It is possible that the author desired to popularize among the higher classes of Roman nobility a broader view of the Epistles of St. Paul. The legend of Seneca's conversion to Christianity, on which this correspondence is based, owes its origin to the ethico-theistic character of the Stoic philosopher's writings.

This correspondence is found in many editions of the works of Seneca, notably in the stereotyped edition of his prose-writings by *Fr. Haase,* Leipzig, 1852—1853; 1893—1895, iii. 476—481; L. A. Senecae opera quae supersunt. Supplementum, ed. *Fr. Haase,* Leipzig, 1902. Separate editions of the correspondence were brought out by *Fr X. Kraus,* in Theol. Quartalschr. (1867), xlix. 603—624, and *E. Westerburg,* Der Ursprung der Sage, daß Seneca Christ gewesen sei, Berlin, 1881, pp. 37—50. For a criticism and commentary on the Letters cf. *J. Kreyher,* L. Annäus Seneca, Berlin, 1887, pp. 170—184; *Zahn,* Gesch. des neutestamentl. Kanons, ii. 2, 612—621. On the relations of Seneca to Christianity cf. *W. Ribbeck,* L. Annäus Seneca, der Philosoph, Hannover, 1887; *Lightfoot,* Epistle to the Philippians, London, 1890: St. Paul and Seneca, pp. 271—333; *J. R. Mozley,* in Dict. of Chr. Biogr., London, 1887, Seneca, p. 610. *M. Baumgarten,* Lucius Annäus Seneca, Rostock, 1895; *L. Friedländer,* Der Philosoph Seneca, in Histor. Zeitschr. (1900), lxxxv. 193—249.

### § 32. Apocryphal Apocalypses.

1. THE APOCALYPSE OF PETER. The eighth century-manuscript to which we owe the fragment of the Gospel of Peter (§ 29, 5) has preserved also a long fragment of the Apocalypse of Peter. It begins in the middle of a speech of the Lord and relates at length a number of visions. Two departed brothers, clothed in celestial glory, appear upon a mountain to the Twelve Apostles. The narrator, one of the Apostles, who speaks of himself in the first person, is permitted to behold a glimpse of heaven, «a very great space outside this world». Directly opposite heaven, but hidden from the gaze of the narrator, is the place of punishment for sinners; the description of the tortures endured there, depicted in glowing colours, takes up the remainder of the narrative. Although the narrator does not name himself, it is clear from intrinsic evidence that he wishes to be recognized as the prince of the Apostles. The identification of the work is made through a quotation from it in Clement of Alexandria. He introduces part of a passage (verse 26) with the words: *Πέτρος*

[1] De viris illustr., c. 12.

ἐν τῇ ἀποκαλύψει φησί[1]. In many places during the earlier centuries, even in ecclesiastical circles, this work enjoyed great popularity. Not only is it often quoted by Clement of Alexandria, but in his *Hypotyposes* he judged it worthy of a commentary[2]. In the Muratorian Fragment (according to the traditional and well-founded exposition of the text) this Apocalypse is held to be canonical, although it is admitted that some Christians do not share that opinion (quam quidam ex nostris legi in ecclesia nolunt). Though Eusebius[3] and Jerome[4] rejected it as non-canonical, it continued to be read on Good Friday in some of the churches of Palestine as late as the middle of the fifth century[5]. It was probably composed in the first half of the second century; the place of its origin cannot be determined. It has some points of contact with the Second Epistle of Peter; hence it is supposed that pseudo-Peter had it before him, and that he drew from it the impulse to pose in the person of the prince of the Apostles. Antique-heathen ideas of Hades are traceable in its descriptions of the pains of hell, particularly Orphic-Pythagorean traditions. But their presence in the author's mind is probably explained by the use of Judaistic literary sources, and not of heathen works.

This fragment was published in 1892. The most important editions, translations, and recensions of it are quoted in § 29, 5. Cf. besides *A. Dieterich,* Nekyia, Beiträge zur Erklärung der neuentdeckten Petrusapokalypse, Leipzig, 1893; *Harnack*, in Texte und Untersuchungen, etc. (1895), xiii. 1, 71—73. As far as we can now judge, there is no relation between this ancient Greek apocalypse and the *Apocalypsis Petri per Clementem* (containing explanations alleged to have been given by St. Peter to St. Clement of Rome about revelations alleged to have been made by Christ to Peter himself), preserved in Arabic and Ethiopic manuscripts, a miscellaneous collection scarcely older than the eighth century; cf. *E. Bratke,* in Zeitschr. für wissenschaftl. Theol. (1893), i. 454—493. There is an English translation of the latter by *Andrew Rutherford,* in Ante-Nicene Fathers (Am. ed. 1885), ix. 145—147.

2. THE APOCALYPSE OF PAUL. In contents the Apocalypse of Paul is close a kin to the Apocalypse of Peter. On the other hand, it has reached us complete, not only in the original Greek, but in a series of translations and recensions. There exists, however, no reliable edition of this work, and there is yet uncertainty as to the mutual relations of the texts that have reached us. Very probably it will be found that the Latin translation, first published by *James* in 1893, is a much truer witness to the original than the Greek text published in 1866 by Tischendorf. Important service is rendered to the critical study of the Greek text by an ancient Syriac version. In this Apocalypse we are introduced to the mysteries that Paul beheld when he ascended to the third Heaven, «and was caught up into Paradise and heard

[1] Eclog. proph., c. 41. [2] *Eus.*, Hist. eccl., vi. 14, 1. [3] Ib., iii. 3, 2; 25, 4.
[4] De viris illustr., c. 1. [5] *Sozom.*, Hist. eccl., vii. 19.

secret words which it is not granted to man to utter» (2 Cor. xii. 2 ff.). It pretends to be the work of Paul, but not to be destined for the general public. It opens with a brief statement to the effect that in the days of Theodosius, and by the direction of an angel, the work had been discovered beneath the house in which Paul lived while at Tarsus. Through the Prefect of the city this book was delivered to the emperor, and by him either the original or a copy was sent to Jerusalem. In the company of an angel, Paul leaves this world, beholds on his way the departure of the souls of the just and the sinful, and arrives at the place of the just souls, in the shining land of promise, on the shore of the Acherusian Lake, out of which the City of God arises. Thence he is led to the place of the godless and beholds the manifold sufferings of the damned. Finally he is allowed to visit Paradise, where Adam and Eve had committed the first sin. The narrative exhibits a fertile imagination, and considerable power of invention. It cannot be shown that it is in any way dependent on the Apocalypse of Peter. The work itself suggests that it was composed in or about the time of Theodosius (379—395), and in or near Jerusalem. Traces of it first appear in the Tractates or Homilies of St. Augustine on the Gospel of John (98, 8) delivered about 416, and in the Church History of Sozomen (vii. 19) written about 440. St. Augustine judges with severity the deception practised by the writer, but Sozomen is witness that in other circles, especially among the monks, the work met with approval. During the Middle Ages its popularity was great, as is seen from the many versions preserved: Latin, German, French, and English.

The Greek, or rather a Greek text was published by *C. Tischendorf,* in Apocalypses apocryphae, Leipzig, 1866, pp. 34—69 (cf. pp. XIV—XVIII). He used two late manuscripts, one of which was a copy of the other. The ancient Latin version was edited from an eighth-century manuscript, by *James,* Apocrypha anecdota, Cambridge, 1893, pp. 1—42. The ancient Syriac versions have reached us only in translation of the same. An English translation was printed by *J. Perkins,* in Journal of the American Oriental Society (1866), viii. 183—212. Cf. *Andrew Rutherford,* in Ante-Nicene Fathers (Am. ed. 1885), ix. 151—166. From another manuscript *P. Zingerle* published a German translation, in Vierteljahrsschrift für deutsch- und englisch-theologische Forschung und Kritik (1871), iv. 139—183. For later Latin and German recensions cf. *H. Brandes,* Visio S. Pauli, ein Beitrag zur Visions-literatur, mit einem deutschen und zwei lateinischen Texten, Halle, 1885. He has also treated of French and English translations, in Englische Studien (1884), vii. 34—65. For Slavonic texts, manuscripts and printed works cf. *Bonwetsch,* in *Harnack,* Gesch. der altchristl. Literatur, i. 910 f. — The Apocalypse of Paul is to be carefully distinguished from the Ἀναβατικὸν Παύλου, or Ascension of Paul, a second- or third-century work mentioned only by *Epiphanius* (Haer., 38, 2). Like the former it claims to contain the unspeakable words of 2 Cor. xii. 2 ff. But it was replete with abominable things (ἀρρητουργίας ἔμπλεων) and was used exclusively by Cainites and «Gnostics». The so-called *Decretum Gelasii de recip. et non recip. libris* mentions in connection with this Apocalypse two others of which we know

nothing more: *Revelatio quae appellatur Thomae apocrypha; Revelatio quae appellatur Stephani apocrypha* (*Thiel,* Epist. Rom. Pont., Brunsberg, 1868, i. 465). The so-called Catalogue of the Sixty Canonical Books mentions Ζαχαρίου ἀποκάλυψις. The so-called Stichometria of St. Nicephorus also makes mention of an apocryphal work Ζαχαρίου πατρὸς Ἰωάννου. Berendts is of opinion that in both places there is question of a work on the father of John the Baptist, written in Palestine in the third or fourth century, for the purpose of explaining the words of our Lord concerning the blood of Zachary, the son of Barachias (Mt. xxiii. 35; cf. Luke xi. 51). Cf. *A. Berendts,* Studien über Zacharias-Apokryphen und Zacharias-Legenden, Leipzig, 1895. Under the first of these titles we may probably recognize a spurious Apocalypse current under the name of the prophet Zachary. *P. Macler,* L'Apocalypse arabe de Daniel, publiée, traduite et annotée, Paris, 1904.

## FOURTH SECTION.

# THE ANTI-HERETICAL LITERATURE OF THE SECOND CENTURY

### § 33. Anti-Gnostics. Their lost works.

1. PRELIMINARY REMARKS. Against the heresies indicated in the preceding pages, the representatives of the Church undertook to demonstrate that she alone was in exclusive possession of the truth and that only her teachings were justifiable. The doctrines most directly threatened or imperilled were naturally those defended with the greatest warmth; thus in the conflict with Gnosticism the belief in the unity of God because at once the most important of the ecclesiastical doctrines. At the same time the sources and criteria of the teachings of the Church were naturally a matter of discussion. The anti-heretical was therefore destined to greatly surpass the apologetic literature as a propædeutic, and a foundation for theology or the science of faith. The anti-Gnostic writings of the apologists Justin Martyr, Miltiades, Melito, and Theophilus of Antioch have been lost; indeed, that has been the general fate of the greater part of the anti-Gnostic literature.

2. AGRIPPA CASTOR. A writer of this name, otherwise unknown work to us, wrote during the reign of Hadrian (117—138) a polemical against Basilides. Eusebius makes mention of it and praises it highly[1].

For the «testimonia antiquorum» cf. *Routh,* Reliquiae Sacrae, 2. ed., Oxford, 1846—1848, i. 83—90 (*Migne,* PG., v. 1269—1272).

3. HEGESIPPUS. We possess more copious remains of the «Memorabilia» of Hegesippus. He was an Oriental, born in Syria or in Palestine and of Jewish origin, according to Eusebius[2]; at least he was acquainted with Aramaic. An interest in the true Christian teaching *(ὁ ὀρθὸς λόγος)* led him to the West, and as far as Rome,

[1] Hist. eccl., iv. 7, 6—8; *Hieron.,* De viris illustr., c. 21.
[2] Hist. eccl., iv. 22, 8.

where, from his own words (though there is a dispute as to their proper translation), we learn with certainty[1] that he sojourned under Pope Anicetus (about 155—166) and even survived the reign of Pope Eleutherus (about 174—189). On his return to his native land he wrote five books that Eusebius sometimes calls *πέντε συγγράματα* (l. c. iv. 8, 2) and again *πέντε ὑπομνήματα* (l. c. iv. 22, 1; cf. ii. 23, 3). The latter title is used by Hegesippus himself (ii. 23, 8). Though the fragments in Eusebius are mostly historical in character, it does not seem possible to reconcile his excerpts with the judgment of Jerome[2], according to which the work of Hegesippus resembled a history of the Church. It must have been more like a polemical treatise against Gnosticism, with the purpose of setting forth the evidence of ecclesiastical tradition, particularly its close dependency on the uninterrupted episcopal succession. Indeed, Eusebius places the venerable Oriental first among the orthodox opponents of the new Gnostic heresy, and adds that he had set up a memorial in the simplest form to the pure tradition of the Apostolic preaching *(ἁπλουστάτῃ συντάξει γραφῆς)*[3]. Short fragments of Hegesippus are found also in Philippus Sidetes and Stephen Gobarus.

For the last traces of the complete text of the Memorabilia cf. *Th. Zahn,* Der griechische Irenäus und der ganze Hegesippus im 16. und im 17. Jahrhundert, in Theol. Literaturblatt, 1893, pp. 495—497; *E. Bratke,* ib. 1894, pp. 65—67. The fragments extant are found in *Routh,* l. c., i. 203—284; *Migne,* l. c., v. 1307—1328; *A. Hilgenfeld,* Hegesippus, in Zeitschr. für wissenschaftl. Theol. (1876), xix. 177—229; *Th. Zahn,* Forschungen zur Gesch. des neutestamentl. Kanons, etc. (1900), vi. 228—273. For the hypothesis of *Lightfoot* that the Papal catalogue in Epiphanius (Haer., 27, 6) is taken from the work of Hegesippus, see *Funk,* Kirchengeschichtl. Abhandlungen und Untersuchungen (1897), i. 373—390; *Zahn,* l. c., pp. 243 to 246; *J. Flamion,* in Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique (1900), i. 672—678; *J. Chapman,* in Revue Bénédictine (1901), xviii. 410—417; (1902), xix. 13—30, 144—170 (for Lightfoot). — *Th. Jess,* Hegesippos nach seiner kirchengeschichtlichen Bedeutung, in Zeitschr. für die histor. Theol. (1865), xxxv. 3—95. *K. F. Nösgen,* Der kirchliche Standpunkt Hegesipps, in Zeitschr. für Kirchengesch. (1877—1878), ii. 193—233. *A. Hilgenfeld,* Hegesippus und die Apostelgeschichte, in Zeitschr. für wissenschaftl. Theol. (1878), xxi. 297—330. *H. Dannreuther,* Du témoignage d'Hégésippe sur l'église chrétienne aux deux premiers siècles, Nancy, 1878. *H. S. Lawlor,* Two notes on Eusebius, in Hermathena (1900), xi. 10—49.

4. RHODON. During the reign of Commodus (180—192) this writer, born in Asia Minor and subsequently a disciple of Tatian at Rome, developed an apparently manifold literary activity. He wrote a work against the sect of Marcion, and a Commentary on the Hexaemeron *(εἰς τὴν ἑξαήμερον ὑπόμνημα)*, perhaps against Apelles (§ 25, 7)[4]. In his work against Marcion, from which Eusebius has quoted interesting

[1] Ib., iv. 22, 2—3. [2] De viris illustr., c. 22.
[3] Hist. eccl., iv. 8, 1—2. [4] *Eus.*, Hist. eccl., v. 13.

paragraphs, Rhodon made known his intention to write a reply to the «Problems» of Tatian, under the title προβλημάτων ἐπιλύσεις. Jerome has wrongly [1] attributed to him an anonymous work against the Montanists (§ 35, 2) mentioned in Eusebius.

*Routh,* l. c., i. 435—446 (*Migne,* l. c., v. 1331—1338).

5. PHILIPPUS OF GORTYNA, MODESTUS, MUSANUS. To the same period belong Philippus, bishop of Gortyna in Crete, who wrote against Marcion [2], Modestus who exposed the same errors with special skill [3], and Musanus who addressed a very grave Letter to some brethren who had apostatized to the sect of the Encratites [4]. At a later date other writings circulated under the name of Modestus [5]

6. HERACLITUS AND OTHERS. In evidence of the industry of «ecclesiastical men» at the end of the second century Eusebius [6] mentions «the work of Heraclitus on the Apostle (Paul), and that of Maximus on the origin of evil and the creation of matter, questions much discussed by heretics, the work of Candidus on the Hexaemeron and that of Apion on the same subject, also a work of Sextus on the resurrection, and a work of Arabianus on another subject». Jerome made some additions to this passage of Eusebius [7]

The mention of Maximus as a Christian writer must be an error; elsewhere (Praep. evang., vii. 22) Eusebius quotes a lengthy passage from the supposed work of Maximus. *Routh,* l. c., ii. 75—121; *Migne,* l. c., v. 1337—1356. The whole paragraph appears, word for word, in the work of St. Methodius of Olympus on free will. *Bonwetsch,* Methodius von Olympus, Schriften, 1891, i. 15—38. Probably Eusebius was misled into attributing the work of St. Methodius to an older, real or imaginary, writer named Maximus. Cf. *Th. Zahn,* in Zeitschr. für Kirchengesch. (1887—1888), ix. 224—229. *J. A. Robinson,* The Philocalia of Origen, Cambridge, 1893, pp. XL—XLIX.

### § 34. Irenæus of Lyons.

1. HIS LIFE. Irenæus was born in Asia Minor, about 140, in or near Smyrna, it is supposed. He was wont to repeat [8] that he listened, as a child, to the discourses of Polycarp, the aged bishop of Smyrna. He is said, on later evidence, to have been at Rome when Polycarp died (Febr. 23., 155). He was certainly a presbyter of the Church of Lyons during the persecution of its members by Marcus Aurelius. On that occasion the clergy of Lyons and Vienne, most of whom were in prison, sent Irenæus (177—178) to Pope Eleutherus at Rome, with a letter that treated of the Montanist troubles, and in which they styled Irenæus «one who was zealous for the

[1] De viris illustr., cc. 37, 39.
[2] *Eus.,* Hist. eccl., iv. 25; cf. iv. 21, 23, 5. [3] Ib., iv. 25; cf. 21.
[4] Ib., iv. 28; cf. 21. [5] *Hieron.,* De viris illustr., c. 32.
[6] Hist. eccl., v. 27. [7] De viris illustr., cc. 46—51.
[8] *Eus.,* Hist. eccl., v. 20, 5; *Iren.,* Adv. haer., iii. 3, 4, ed. *Massuet.*

Testament of Christ» [1]. On his return he was made bishop of Lyons in succession to the martyred Pothinus, and as such devoted his energies mainly to the overthrow of the false Gnosis. During the reign of Pope Victor I. (189—198/199) he took a leading part in the discussions that arose about the Easter celebration, «doing honour to his name *(Εἰρηναῖος)* and bearing himself as a peacemaker *(εἰρηνοποιός)*», says Eusebius [2] The date of his death is unknown. According to a tradition first met with in Jerome [3] he suffered martyrdom under Septimius Severus (193—211).

*Ch. E. Freppel,* St. Irénée, Paris, 1861; 3. ed. 1886. *H. Ziegler,* Irenäus, der Bischof von Lyon, Berlin, 1871. *R. A. Lipsius,* Die Zeit des Irenäus von Lyon, in Histor. Zeitschr. (1872), xxviii. 241—295. *A. Gouilloud,* St.Irénée et son temps, Lyon, 1876. *E. Montet,* La légende d'Irénée et l'introduction du christianisme à Lyon, Genève, 1880. *R. A. Lipsius,* Irenæus, in Dict. of Christ. Biogr., London, 1882, iii. 253—279. *Zahn,* Forschungen zur Gesch. des neutestamentl. Kanons, etc. (1891), iv. 249—283; (1900), vi. 27—40. *Harnack,* Gesch. der altchristl. Literatur (1897), ii. 1, 320—333.

2. THE «ADVERSUS HAERESES». The most important legacy of Irenæus is an extensive work against Gnosticism, entitled «Detection and Overthrow of the pretended but false Gnosis» *(ἔλεγχος καὶ ἀνατροπὴ τῆς ψευδωνύμου γνώσεως)*, usually known as «Adversus Haereses» [4]. It is unfortunate that we no longer possess the original Greek of this work, which has been handed down, however, in a Latin translation that was executed shortly after the composition of the original, and exhibits a most conscientious fidelity, even a slavish literalness. Fragments of the Greek text, notably the greater part of the first book, have reached us through citations from it made by later writers, Hippolytus, Eusebius, Epiphanius, and others. There are also some short fragments preserved in a Syriac translation. According to the introduction to the first book the work was begun at the request of a friend, probably a bishop, who wished to know more about the heresy of Valentine, with a view to its refutation. In the execution of his enterprise the plan seems to have grown larger as the author advanced, it is also supposed that a considerable period of time elapsed between the composition of the first book and the completion of the fifth. We have no means of fixing more definitely the periods of composition of the separate books of this work; in the third book (iii. 3, 3) Eleutherus is designated as the contemporary bishop of Rome (about 174—189). Methodical disposition of the material, consecutiveness of thought, and progressive exposition are to a great extent wanting in the «Adversus Haereses». The first book is mostly taken up with the «detection»

[1] *Eus.*, Hist. eccl., v. 4, 2. [2] Ib., v. 24, 18.

[3] Comm. in Is. ad 64, 4 ff.

[4] *Hieron.*, De vir. illustr., c. 35, after *Eus.*, Hist. eccl., ii. 13, 5; iii. 28, 6: *πρὸς τὰς αἱρέσεις.*

or exposure of the Gnostic doctrines; the other four are devoted to their «refutation». In the second book dialectico-philosophical arguments predominate, while in the third it is principally ecclesiastical tradition and the Holy Scripture that the author invokes. The main scope of the work is to disprove the Gnostic thesis that the Creator of the world is another than the Supreme God; this teaching is expressly declared (ii. 1, 1) to be the blasphemous foundation of all Gnosis. The fourth book rounds out the scriptural proofs, confirming with the sayings of the Lord (*per Domini sermones,* iv. praef.) the previous teaching of the Apostles *(sententia apostolorum).* Among the sayings of the Lord are understood also the words of the prophets (cf. iv 2, 3). The fifth book is eschatological in character. The doctrine of the resurrection of the body is variously defended, and at the end (cc. 32—36) are developed the Chiliastic theories peculiar to Irenæus. His description of the Gnostic systems is based almost entirely on his own reading of their writings (§ 25, 3). He is also well-acquainted with such other ecclesiastical writers as Ignatius, Polycarp, Papias, Justin Martyr, and Hegesippus.

For the latest traces of the Greek text of the «Adversus haereses» cf. the study of *Zahn* (§ 33, 3). *Fr. Loofs,* Die Handschriften der lateinischen Übersetzung des Irenäus und ihre Kapitelteilung, in Kirchengesch. Studien, H. Reuter zum 70. Geburtstag gewidmet, Leipzig, 1888, pp. 1—93, separately printed, Leipzig, 1890. *G. Mercati,* Di alcuni nuovi sussidii per la critica del testo di S. Cipriano, Rome, 1899, pp. 100—107. *Id.,* Note di litterature biblica e cristiana antica (Studi e Testi, v.), Rome, 1901, pp. 241—243. The following editions are based on an independent study of the manuscripts: *D. Erasmus,* Basle, 1526; *Fr. Feuardent,* Cologne, 1596 (reprinted in 1639); *J. E. Grabe,* Oxford, 1702; *R. Massuet,* Paris, 1710 (reprinted Venice, 1734); *A. Stieren,* Leipzig, 1848—1853; *W. W. Harvey,* Cambridge, 1857. It is admitted that by far the best edition is that of *Massuet,* reprinted in *Migne,* PG., vii (1857). Some new fragments of the Greek text were published by *A. Papadopulos-Kerameus,* in Ἀνάλεκτα ἱεροσολυμιτικῆς σταχυολογίας, St. Petersburg, 1891, i. 387—389; cf. *J. Haussleiter,* in Zeitschr. für Kirchengesch. (1893—1894), xiv. 69—73. For the Syriac and Armenian fragments see *Harvey* l. c., ii. 431—453, and *P. Martin,* in *Pitra,* Analecta Sacra, Paris, 1883, iv. 17 sq. 292 ff. There is a German translation by *H. Hayd,* in Bibliothek der Kirchenväter, Kempten, 1872—1873. There is an English translation of the writings of Irenæus by *Roberts* and *Rambaut,* in Ante-Nicene Fathers (Am. ed. 1885), i. 315—578.

3. THE «ADVERSUS HAERESES» CONTINUED. For Irenæus the source and standard of faith is the self-identical apostolic tradition that is continuous in the Church. The unbroken succession of the bishops, the representatives of the ecclesiastical magisterium in the churches founded by the Apostles, guarantees and proves the apostolicity of the doctrine taught in these churches; the Apostles appointed as their successors only «very perfect and blameless men», and these in turn handed down to their successors the doctrine of the Apostles

pure and undefiled[1]. As it would be too tedious to enumerate in such a work the official succession of all the churches *(omnium ecclesiarum enumerare successiones)*, he holds it sufficient to prove that «the greatest and the oldest church, the one well-known to all men, founded and established at Rome by the two most glorious Apostles Peter and Paul», can trace back the list of its bishops to the days of the Apostles; its teaching can, therefore, rightly lay claim to the character of apostolicity: «Ad hanc enim ecclesiam propter potentiorem (potiorem) principalitatem necesse est omnem convenire ecclesiam, hoc est eos qui sunt undique fideles, in qua semper ab his qui sunt undique conservata est ea quae est ab apostolis traditio» (III. 3, 2). These words may be rightly translated as follows: «With this church, because of its higher rank, every church must agree, i. e. the faithful of all places, in which (in communion with which) the apostolic tradition has been always preserved by the (faithful) of all places«. Heretics wrongly maintained that the Jesus born of Mary was another than the Christ who descended from Heaven. «Otherwise, Matthew could well have said (i. 18): 'The generation of *Jesus* was in this wise.' Foreseeing, however, the perverters of faith and forestalling their deceit, the Holy Spirit said through Matthew *(Spiritus Sanctus per Matthaeum ait)*: 'the generation of *Christ* was in this wise (i. 18), and they shall call his name Emmanuel' (i. 22 f.), that we might not consider him a mere man, and believe that he was another than the Christ, but rather know that He is one and the same» (iii. 16, 2). He must be God and Man in the same person, «for if it were not a man who had overcome the opponent of mankind, the enemy would not have been vanquished in the right way *(δικαίως)*. And again, if it were not God who gave to us our salvation, it would not have been firmly assured to us (*βεβαίως*, iii. 18, 7)». «The Word of God became man in order that man, taking on the Word and receiving the Sonship, might be the Son of God» (iii. 19, 1; the text is somewhat uncertain). Irenæus, like Justin[2], recognizes that the Virgin Mother also has her place in the work of salvation. «As Eve, the wife of one man (Adam), though herself yet a virgin, was through her disobedience the cause of death to herself and the entire human race, so Mary, the wife of one man (foreordained for her), and yet herself a virgin, was through her obedience the source of salvation *(causa salutis)* for herself and the whole human race» (iii. 22, 4). «If the former had been disobedient to God, the latter was persuaded to obey Him, that the Virgin Mary might be the advocate *(advocata)* of the Virgin Eve. And as the human race fell into the slavery of death through a virgin, so should it be saved by a virgin; the balance is made even when virginal obedience is weighed against virginal disobedience (v. 19, 1).

[1] Adv. haer., iii. 3, 1. [2] Dial. c. Tryph., c. 100.

*V Courdaveaux,* St. Irénée, in Revue de l'hist. des religions (1890), xxi. 149—175. *F. Cabrol,* La doctrine de St. Irénée et la critique de M. Courdaveaux, Paris and Lyons, 1891. *J. Kunze,* Die Gotteslehre des Irenäus (Dissert. inaug.), Leipzig, 1891. *L. Duncker,* Des hl. Irenäus Christologie, im Zusammenhange mit dessen theologischen und anthropologischen Grundlehren dargestellt, Göttingen, 1843. *G. Molwitz,* De ἀνακεφαλαιώσεως in Irenaei theologia potestate (Dissert. inaug.), Dresden, 1874. *E. Klebba,* Die Anthropologie des hl. Irenäus, Münster, 1894 (Kirchengesch. Studien, ii. 3). *H. Hagemann,* Die römische Kirche in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten, Freiburg, 1864, pp. 598—627: «Irenäus über den Primat der römischen Kirche.» Acta et decreta ss. concil. recent. Collectio Lacensis, Freiburg, 1873, iv. v—xxxiv· S. Irenaei de ecclesiae Romanae principatu testimonium. Cf. *Ad. Harnack,* in Sitzungsberichte der kgl. preuß. Akad. der Wissensch., Berlin, 1893, pp. 939—955; *J. Chapman,* in Revue Bénédictine (1895), xii. 49—64; *Funk,* in Kirchengeschichtl. Abhandlungen und Untersuchungen (1897), i. 1—23; *L. Hopfenmüller,* S. Irenaeus de Eucharistia (Dissert. inaug.), Bamberg, 1867; *J. Koerber,* S. Irenaeus de gratia sanctificante (Dissert. inaug.), Würzburg, 1865; *L. Atzberger,* Gesch. der christl. Eschatologie innerhalb der vornicän. Zeit, Freiburg, 1896, pp. 219—263; *J. Werner,* Der Paulinismus des Irenäus, Leipzig, 1889 (Texte und Untersuchungen, etc., vi. 2); *Gry,* Le millénarisme dans ses origines et son développement, Paris, 1904.

4. OTHER WRITINGS. Irenæus wrote many other works that have perished, with the exception of a few insignificant fragments. He says (Adv. haer. i. 27, 4; iii. 12, 12) that he intended to write a special refutation of Marcion; we do not know whether he carried out his intention. To the Roman priest Florinus, who leaned toward the teachings of Valentine, he addressed a work on the Monarchy (of God), or to the effect that God is not the author of evil *(περὶ μοναρχίας ἢ περὶ τοῦ μὴ εἶναι τὸν θεὸν ποιητὴν κακῶν).* Later, when Florinus had abandoned the Church, Irenæus wrote a treatise «On the Ogdoad» *(περὶ ὀγδοάδος),* probably on the Valentinian cycle of Æons. Eusebius quotes a passage from each of these works [1]. We gather from a Syriac fragment that Irenaeus wrote to Pope Victor entreating him to withstand Florinus and to suppress his writings. Irenæus also wrote to the same Pope apropos of the Paschal celebration, likewise to «many other heads of churches» [2]. From one such letter Eusebius made a lengthy excerpt [3]. It was perhaps the same question that he treated in a letter «On Schism» *(περὶ σχίσματος)* written to Blastus, a Roman Quartodeciman [4]. Eusebius mentions [5] a brief work of Irenæus against the heathens, entitled: *πρὸς Ἕλληνας λόγος περὶ ἐπιστήμης ἐπιγεγραμμένος,* which Jerome incorrectly reads [6]: *Contra gentes volumen breve et de disciplina aliud.* Eusebius gives also the titles of some other works: a demonstration of the apostolic preaching *(εἰς ἐπίδειξιν τοῦ ἀποστολικοῦ κηρύγματος),* and «a book of miscellaneous discourses» *(βιβλίον τι διαλέξεων διαφόρων),* probably

[1] Hist. eccl., v. 20. [2] Ib., v. 24, 18. [3] Ib., v. 24, 11 ff.
[4] Ib., v. 20, 1. [5] Ib., v. 26. [6] De viris illustr., c. 35.

a collection of homilies. Maximus Confessor quotes[1] some phrases from a work of St. Irenæus on faith *(περὶ πίστεως λόγοι)*. Little credit is to be given to the inscription of a Syriac fragment purporting to be the work of «St. Irenæus, bishop of Lyons, (taken) from his exposition of the first (chapter?) of the Canticle of Canticles». The four Greek fragments, known from their editor, Chr. M. Pfaff (1714), as the Pfaffian Fragments, were until quite lately an object of erudite dissension. Harnack has proved them to be forgeries of Pfaff.

The fragments of other writings are found in the already cited editions of *Adversus haereses*, e. g. in *Massuet*, Paris, 1710, pp. 339—348; *Migne*, PG., vii. 1225—1264; *Stieren*, i. 821—897; *Harvey*, ii. 454—511. Cf. *Pitra*, Analecta Sacra, Paris, 1884, ii. 194—210. The Syriac and Armenian fragments are in *Harvey*, ii. 454—469, and somewhat increased in *Martin-Pitra*, l. c., iv. 26 ff. 299 ff.; cf. *Preuschen*, in *Harnack*, Gesch. der altchristl. Literatur, i. 266 ff.; *Harnack*, l. c., ii. 1, 518 ff. For the fragments of the letter or letters to Pope St. Victor, see *Zahn*, l. c., iv. 283—308. The question of the Pfaffian Fragments is treated by *Harnack*, in Texte und Untersuchungen, xx, new series (1900), v. 3, 1—69. Cf. *P. Batiffol*, in Bulletin de littérature ecclésiast. (1901), ii. 189—200.

## § 35. Anti-Montanists.

1. PRELIMINARY REMARKS. The most prominent element in the controversy between the Montanists and the Catholics were the ecstatic discourses of the prophets of Montanism. These ecstasies, whether in the shape of swoonings or delirium, were put forward by the Montanists as evidence of the purity and truth of their revelations. The Catholics denounced them as deceitful signs of pseudo-prophecy[2] We have already mentioned the anti-Montanist letters of Apollinaris, bishop of Hierapolis, and the work of the apologist Miltiades (§ 19, 1 2). The statement of the author of *Praedestinatus* (i. 26; cf. 86) that Pope Soter († ca. 174) wrote a book against the Montanists, is subject to caution.

2. THE ANONYMOUS OF 192/193. We have to regret the loss of a polemical work against Montanism from which Eusebius made several excerpts[3]. Its three books included not only a refutation of the Montanist teaching, but also detailed information concerning the history of the Montanist prophets. From internal data it must have been published not later than the early part of 193. The author was a priest of Asia Minor; his name is not given by Eusebius. Jerome[4] has too hastily identified him with the anti-Gnostic Rhodon (§ 33, 4).

The Eusebian fragments of the «Anonymous» are in *Routh*, Reliquiae Sacrae (2. ed.), ii. 181—217; also in *Migne*, PG., x. 145—156. Cf. *G. N. Bonwetsch*, Die Geschichte des Montanismus, Erlangen, 1881, pp. 27—29; *Th. Zahn*, Forschungen zur Gesch. des neutestamentl. Kanons, etc. (1893), v. 13—21.

[1] *Migne*, PG., xci. 276.
[2] *Tertull.*, Adv. Marc., iv. 22.
[3] Hist. eccl., v. 16 17.
[4] De viris illustr., cc. 37. 39.

3. APOLLONIUS. The anti-Montanist work of the «ecclesiastical writer» Apollonius was another important historical authority used by Eusebius in his description of the Phrygian heresy [1]. This work of Apollonius was very probably written in 197, and contained abundant historical material. Apollonius was also a native of Asia Minor, and is said in *Praedestinatus* (i. 26 27 86) to have been bishop of Ephesus.

The Eusebian fragments are collected in *Routh*, l. c., i. 463—485; *Migne*, l. c., v. 1381—1386. Cf. *Bonwetsch*, l. c., 29 ff.; *Zahn*, l. c., v. 21—28.

4. CAIUS. In the reign of Pope Zephyrin (199—217) the Roman Caius, an «ecclesiastical» and «very learned» man [2] published a polemical dialogue against the Montanist Proclus. Eusebius gathered a few phrases from it for his history [3] In 1888, J. Gwynn published, with a commentary, some new fragments of this dialogue taken from the «Capitula» of St. Hippolytus against Caius. In this work Hippolytus defended the Apocalypse of St. John against Caius who had declared in his dialogue that it was the work of Cerinthus. The information concerning Caius found in Photius [4], when not based on Eusebius, is untrustworthy; he confounds Caius with Hippolytus or rather with the author of the »Philosophoumena».

The Caius fragments are collected in *Routh*, l. c., ii. 123—158; *Migne*, l. c., x. 25—36. For the fragments of the «Capitula» of Hippolytus against Caius cf. § 54, 3. For Caius consult especially *Zahn*, Gesch. des neutestamentl. Kanons, etc., ii. 985—991. *G. Salmon*, in Dict. of Christian Biogr., London, 1877, i. 384—386.

5. AN UNKNOWN WRITER. Epiphanius knew and used an ancient work that criticized very severely the prophecy of the Montanists, especially their ecstatic utterances [5]. Voigt believed that this was a work by Rhodon; Rolffs held it to have been written by Hippolytus. Both opinions are subject to grave objections.

*H. G. Voigt*, Eine verschollene Urkunde des antimontanistischen Kampfes. Die Berichte des Epiphanius über die Kataphryger und Quintillianer untersucht, Leipzig, 1891. *E. Rolffs*, Urkunden aus dem antimontanistischen Kampfe des Abendlandes, in Texte und Untersuchungen, Leipzig, 1895, xii. 99 ff. 122 ff.

### § 36. Writings of Ecclesiastical Authorities and Synods, chiefly concerning Heresies and Schisms.

1. WRITINGS OF POPES. Pope Soter (ca. 166—174) wrote a Letter to the Christians of Corinth in the name of the Roman community (§ 8, 2 3); he is also said to have written a work against

[1] Hist. eccl., v. 18. [2] *Eus.*, Hist. eccl., ii. 25, 6; vi. 20, 3.
[3] Ib., vi. 20; ii. 25, 6—7; iii. 28, 1—2, 31, 4. [4] Bibl. Cod. 48.
[5] Haer., 48, 1—13.

the Montanists (§ 35, 1). The Roman bishop who, according to Tertullian[1], gave letters of communion to the Montanist communities in Asia Minor, but soon withdrew them, was either Pope Eleutherus (ca. 174—189; cf. § 34, 1) or his successor, Pope Victor I. (189 to 198/199). During the great controversy concerning the time of the Easter celebration, Pope Victor wrote several Encyclical Letters, it is supposed to all the churches; among them were a Letter which urged the holding of synods for the settling of these troubles[2], a Letter in promulgation of the decision of a Roman synod[3], and a Letter which excluded the refractory churches of Asia Minor from ecclesiastical communion on the ground that their stubborn retention of the Quartodeciman custom proclaimed them heretics[4]. Victor was a native of Roman Africa, and according to St. Jerome[5] wrote some theological treatises in Latin *(mediocria de religione volumina*[6]*)*. For this reason he is reckoned by St. Jerome the first of the Latin ecclesiastical writers. According to Optatus of Mileve Pope Zephyrin (199—217), wrote a work against heretics[7]

For the «testimonia» concerning Pope Victor, cf. *Caspari,* Quellen zur Gesch. des Taufsymbols und der Glaubensregel, Christiania, 1875, iii. 413 f. 432 ff.; *Harnack,* Der pseudocyprianische Traktat *De aleatoribus,* in Texte und Untersuchungen, Leipzig, 1888, v. 1, 110 ff. For the tractate *De aleatoribus* that Harnack adjudicated to Pope Victor, cf. § 51, 6 g. *J. Turmel,* L'Église romaine jusqu'au pape Victor, in Revue catholique des Églises, 1905, 3—21.

2. DIONYSIUS OF CORINTH. Dionysius, bishop of Corinth and contemporary of Pope Soter (see p. 123), was highly esteemed in his time, and his judgment sought for by many churches in matters of controversy There was extant in the days of Eusebius a collection of his seven «Catholic» Letters written to as many communities, together with a private letter of Dionysius[8]. The last of these «Catholic» Letters was written in grateful response to a letter of the Roman community; Eusebius has preserved for us four interesting and valuable passages[9]. He says also[10] that the Letter to the Nicomedians was directed against the heresy of Marcion. Apropos of the Letter to the community of Cnossus in Crete, Eusebius tells us[11] of a reply to Dionysius, written by Pinytus, bishop of Cnossus. What Jerome relates[12] about Dionysius and Pinytus is taken from Eusebius.

Cf. *Routh,* Reliquiae Sacrae (2. ed.), i. 175—201: BB. Dionysius et Pinytus.

[1] Adv. Prax., c. 1. [2] *Polycrates,* in *Eus.,* Hist. eccl., v. 24, 8.
[3] *Eus.,* l. c., v. 23, 3. [4] Ib., v. 24, 9.
[5] De viris illustr., c. 53; cf. c. 34.
[6] *Hier.,* Chron. ad a. Abr. 2209.
[7] De schism. Donat., i. 9. [8] *Eus.,* Hist. eccl., iv. 23.
[9] Ib., iv. 23, 10—12; ii. 25, 8. [10] Ib., iv. 23, 4. [11] Ib., iv. 23, 7—8.
[12] De viris illustr., cc. 27—28.

3. SERAPION OF ANTIOCH. Serapion, bishop of Antioch (199—211), wrote many Letters, the addresses of some of which are made known to us by Eusebius [1], e. g. one to a certain Domninus, who had fallen away from the Christian faith during a persecution and become a Jew; another to Pontius and Caricus against Montanism [2], also a Letter to the Christians of Rhossus warning them not to read the Gospel of Peter (§ 29, 5).

Cf. *Routh,* l. c., i. 447—462; *Migne,* PG., v. 1371—1376. For other details concerning Serapion see *de Buck*, in Acta SS. Oct. (XIII), Paris, 1883, pp. 248—252.

4. SYNODICAL WRITINGS IN THE PASCHAL CONTROVERSY. As a result of the Encyclical Letter of Pope Victor I. (see p. 125) synods were held in several places, to discuss the celebration of Easter, and the decisions of the Fathers were communicated to the Pope. Eusebius gives a list of such synods, and quotes some fragments from their writings [3].

These fragments are two passages from the Letter which a synod of Asia Minor sent to the Pope through Polycrates of Ephesus in justification of the Quartodeciman practice (cf. *Eus.,* Hist. eccl., v. 24, 2—8; iii. 31, 3; *Hier.,* De viris illustr., c. 45), and the conclusion of a Letter sent to the Pope by a synod of Palestine that was presided over by Theophilus, bishop of Cæsarea, and Narcissus, bishop of Jerusalem. It decided for the Western (Roman) practice (cf. *Eus.,* l. c., v. 25; *Hier.,* l. c., c. 43). The latter fragment is in *Routh,* l. c., ii. 1—7; *Migne,* l. c., v. 1365—1372; for the other two see *Routh,* ii. 9—36; *Migne,* v. 1355—1362. The Letter of Bacchyllus, bishop of Corinth, was a private missive (cf. *Eus.,* l. c., v. 23, 4), erroneously stated by *Jerome* (l. c., c. 44) to have been a synodical writing.

## FIFTH SECTION.

# ECCLESIASTICAL LITERATURE DURING THE GENESIS OF CHRISTIAN THEOLOGY

### CHAPTER I.

## THE ORIENTALS.

### § 37. General Considerations.

Since the end of the second century the need of a scientific treatment of the teaching of the Church was felt with increasing force. History, exegesis, and philosophy put forward their claims as auxiliaries of Christian truth. Ecclesiastical literature thus entered upon new lines of development; new aims and new paths were opened up. The older apologists and anti-heretical writers had created a literature of defence and attack; henceforth there was to be, within the Church herself, a peaceful growth of literary activity. This

[1] Hist. eccl., vi. 12; cf. *Hieron.,* De viris illustr., c. 41.
[2] Hist. eccl., v. 19. [3] Ib., v. 23—25.

scientific tendency was liveliest in the Christian East where the catechetical school of Alexandria soon became known as a famous centre and nursery of ecclesiastical science. Its origin is shrouded in obscurity. About 180, it appears in full operation, but as an institution long-since established [1]. It was probably at first only a school for catechumens, but when Pantænus took charge of it, about 180, it must have already acquired the character of a Christian academy in which all Greek science was studied and made to do apologetic service in favour of the Christian cause. Under Clement and Origen it reached the acme of its renown that however began to fade in the fourth century. The devotion to scientific labours now spread from Alexandria to Palestine. Alexander, a disciple of the catechists Pantænus and Clement, began, as bishop of Jerusalem, a theological library in the Holy City itself [2]. A little later, about 233, when Origen sought a new home in Palestine, he opened a school at Cæsarea in which the scientific element was even more strongly emphasized than at Alexandria. In the second half of the same century the learned presbyter Pamphilus laboured actively at Cæsarea for the academical interests of the Church. He is usually credited with having founded there the famous library that was so serviceable to Eusebius and Jerome; there can be no doubt, however, that the beginnings of this most valuable of all the ancient Christian libraries were owing to Origen [3] The Christian masters of Alexandria extended their vigorous and efficient influence as far as Asia Minor. Of the two most important ecclesiastical writers that we meet there in the third century, Gregory Thaumaturgus was a disciple of Origen, bred in his school at Cæsarea, while Methodius of Olympus made it his life-work to oppose the theology of that master.

*H. E. F. Guerike*, De schola quae Alexandriae floruit catechetica, Halle, 1824—1825, i—ii. *C. F. W Hasselbach*, De schola quae Alexandriae floruit catechetica, Stettin, 1826—1839, i—ii. *Ch. Bigg*, The Christian Platonists of Alexandria, Oxford, 1886. *F Lehmann*, Die Katechetenschule zu Alexandria kritisch beleuchtet, Leipzig, 1896 (of small value). *A. Ehrhard*, Die griechische Patriarchalbibliothek von Jerusalem, in Röm. Quartalschr. für christl. Altertumskunde und für Kirchengesch. (1891), v. 217—265 329—331 383—384; (1892), vi. 339—365.

## A. THE ALEXANDRINES.

### § 38. Clement of Alexandria.

1. HIS LIFE. Titus Flavius Clemens was born about 150, probably at Athens [4], it is supposed of heathen parents. After his conversion to Christianity he travelled extensively through Southern Italy, Syria

[1] ἐξ ἀρχαίου ἔθους, *Eus.*, Hist. eccl., v. 10, 1. [2] Ib., vi. 20, 1.
[3] *Hieron.*, De viris illustr., c. 113. [4] *Epiph.*, Haer., 32, 6.

and Palestine, finally through Egypt, seeking everywhere the society and instruction of Christian teachers [1]. At Alexandria he fell under the spell of the catechist Pantænus. As a result, he took up his permanent residence in that city, apparently a little before 180, and became a presbyter of that church [2]. Since about 190 he was the associate and assistant of Pantænus in the work of the school; after the death of the latter, about 200, he took up the head-mastership of the same [3]. As early as 202 or 203 he was obliged to quit Alexandria because of the persecution that broke out under Septimius Severus. We meet him, about 211, in Asia Minor in the company of his former disciple Alexander, the future bishop of Jerusalem [4] A letter of Alexander to Origen, written in 215 or 216, speaks of Clement as a father gone to his rest [5].

*J. H. Reinkens,* De Clemente presbytero alexandrino, homine, scriptore, philosopho, theologo liber, Breslau, 1851. *E. Freppel,* Clément d'Alexandrie, Paris, 1865; 3. ed. Paris, 1886. *B. F. Westcott,* Clement of Alexandria, in Dict. of Christ. Biogr., London, 1877, i. 559—567. *F. Böhringer,* Die griechischen Väter des 3. und 4. Jahrhunderts. 1. Clemens und Origenes (Die Kirche Christi und ihre Zeugen, i. 2, 1, 2. ed.), Zürich, 1869. *Th. Zahn,* Forschungen zur Gesch. des neutestamentl. Kanons, etc. (1884), iii. 156—176.

2. CLEMENT AS A WRITER. He is an epoch-making figure in the history of the growth of early Christian literature. He differs from his teachers inasmuch as they had confined themselves to oral instruction, while he added thereto the use of the written page as an academical means of forming the minds of his pupils [6]. His purpose is the scientific establishment of the teachings of the Church; he is desirous of furnishing it with a good basis of philosophy and of reconciling it with contemporary thought. The source of his frequent slips and errors is to be found in the fact that he is better equipped to appreciate the ideal content of Christian truth than to expound the positive theology of redemption. To the cause of Christianity, which he espoused with a generous zeal, he brought a highly gifted nature and an encyclopedic knowledge. Clement is well-acquainted with the profane writers of Greece, and particularly with the works of Plato. Much of the earlier ecclesiastical literature was also well-known to him. His diction is relatively pure, and his exposition «flowery and exuberant and very agreeable» [7]. Of the extensive «Introduction to Christianity» to which he devoted many years of his life, nearly all has been preserved *(Protrepticus, Paedagogus, Stromata).* He wrote another important work, the *Hypotyposes,* of which only insignificant fragments have come down to us. Similarly, out of a series of minor writings only one Homily has been preserved.

[1] Strom., i. 1, 11. [2] Paed., i. 6, 37. [3] *Eus.,* Hist. eccl., vi. 6.
[4] Ib., vi. 11, 5—6. [5] Ib., vi. 14, 8—9.
[6] Strom., i. 1, 11—14; cf. Eclog. 27. [7] *Phot.,* Bibl. Cod. 110.

The first editions of his works were brought out by *P. Victorius*, Florence, 1550, and by *Fr. Sylburg*, Heidelberg, 1592. The best and most complete edition is that of *J. Potter*, Oxford, 1715 (Venice, 1757), 2 voll., often reprinted, e. g. by *Fr. Oberthür*, Würzburg, 1778—1779, 3 voll.; *R. Klotz*, Leipzig, 1831—1834, 4 voll.; *Migne*, PG., viii—ix. 1857. The edition of *W. Dindorf*, Oxford, 1869, 4 voll., failed to meet the reasonable expectations of many. Cf. *P. de Lagarde*, in Götting. gelehrte Anzeigen, 1870, pp. 801—824, and *Id.*, Symmikta, Göttingen, 1877, pp. 10—24. Valuable contributions to these editions of Clement are found in *Zahn*, Forschungen zur Gesch. des neutestamentl. Kanons, etc. (1884), iii: Supplementum Clementinum. *O. Staehlin*, Observationes criticae in Clementem Alexandrinum (Dissert. inaug.), Erlangen, 1890. *Id.*, Beiträge zur Kenntnis der Handschriften des Clemens Alexandrinus (Progr.), Nürnberg, 1895. *Id.*, Untersuchungen über die Scholien zu Clemens Alex. (Progr.), Nürnberg, 1897. *Preuschen*, in *Harnack*, Gesch. der altchristl. Literatur, i. 296—327. *O. Staehlin*, Zur handschriftlichen Überlieferung des Clemens Alex., Leipzig, 1901 (Texte und Untersuchungen, new series, v. 4).

3. PROTREPTICUS. PAEDAGOGUS. STROMATA. These three treatises are parts of a complete whole[1] designed to act as a graduated or progressive introduction to Christianity. The first part or «Exhortation to the Heathen» *(προτρεπτικὸς πρὸς Ἕλληνας)* is closely related, in form and contents, to the earlier apologetic literature of the second century. It opens with an eloquent invitation to listen no more to the mythical chants about the gods of heathendom, but to the new song of which the Logos that went forth from Sion is at once singer and theme (c. 1). Thereupon it exposes the folly and worthlessness of the heathen religious beliefs and practices (cc. 2—7), and praises the truth made known by the prophets (cc. 8—12). The three books of the *Paedagogus (παιδαγωγός)* are meant as a training in the new Christian life for the reader who has already turned away from heathenism[2]. The first book treats of the educational purpose of the Logos, of the children *(παῖδες)* to be educated, and of the educational method, a combination of love and mildness with wrathful and punitive justice. The other two books contain detailed instruction concerning food and drink, dwellings and furniture, feasts and amusements, sleep and recreation, the relations of the sexes, dress and ornament, and the like. Apart from a few chapters, especially at the beginning and close of the third book, the text does not rise above the level of a sprightly «causerie». It often assumes a facetious tinge and occasionally runs over, especially in polemic, into broad humour. In some later manuscripts two Hymns are added to the *Paedagogus*, a Hymn to Jesus Christ *(ὕμνος τοῦ σωτῆρος Χριστοῦ)* attributed to Clement and perhaps written by him, or at least added by him to the text, and a Hymn to the *Paedagogus (εἰς τὸν παιδαγωγόν)*, by some unknown reader of the work. — In the only manuscript that has reached us of the third and crowning section of

[1] Paed., i. 1; Strom., vi. 1, 1. [2] Cf. Paed., i. 1.

this introduction, it is entitled *στρωματεῖς* or «Miscellanies» (strictly, «Tapestries»). Internal evidence shows that the original title was *κατὰ τὴν ἀληθῆ φιλοσοφίαν γνωστικῶν ὑπομνημάτων στρωματεῖς*, i. e. «Tapestries of scientific commentaries according to the true philosophy» [1]. It was his intention to present in this work a scientific account of the revealed truths of Christianity [2]. The contents however correspond very imperfectly to our just expectations. The *Stromata* are ever relapsing into the propædeutic tone of the *Protrepticus* and the *Paedagogus,* or entering upon lines of apologetic discourse, or taking up questions of practical morality; thus they repeatedly put off the treatment of the theme announced in their opening paragraph. The first book deals chiefly with the importance of philosophy and its utility for Christian knowledge. In the second book the author insists strongly on the superiority of revealed truth to all the works of human reason. In the third and fourth books he calls attention to two practical criteria that differentiate, in striking contrast, the Catholic from the heretical Gnosis — they are the striving for moral perfection visible in virginal and married chastity, and the love of God as made manifest in martyrdom. The fifth book returns to the relations of the true Gnosis and faith, deals with the symbolical presentation of the truths of religion, and enumerates the elements of truth borrowed by the Hellenic from the so-called barbarian (Jewish and Christian) philosophy The sixth and seventh books offer a faithful portrait of the true Gnostic; he is the personification of all Christian perfection. Clement excuses the lack of order and unity in the *Stromata* and accounts for it by recalling to the attention of the reader the peculiar purpose of the work [3] In the preface of the fourth book he confesses that he had hoped to finish the subject in one book, but the abundance of material was so great *(τῷ πλήθει τῶν πραγμάτων)* that he was carried far beyond his original plan [4]; yet at the end of the seventh book he has not mastered it, and feels bound to promise other books [5]; he seems, indeed, to have written an eighth book [6] The above-mentioned manuscript offers an eighth book, but it is only a small tractate, mutilated at beginning and end, on the strictly logical process to be followed in the search for truth. Then follow excerpts from the writings of Theodotus and other disciples of the Oriental school of Valentine, usually known as *Excerpta ex scriptis Theodoti* (§ 25, 5), also selected passages from the Prophets, known as *Ex scripturis propheticis eclogae (ἐκ τῶν προφητικῶν ἐκλογαί).* Zahn holds that these three fragments are selections from the original contents of the eighth book, while von Arnim maintains that they represent rough sketches

[1] Strom., i. 29, 182; iii. 18, 110, al. [2] Paed., i. 1; Strom., vi. 1, 1.
[3] i. 1, 18; iv. 2, 4, al. [4] iv. 1, 1. [5] vii. 18, 111.
[6] *Eus.,* Hist. eccl., vi. 13, 1; *Phot.,* Bibl. Cod. 111.

and preliminary studies of Clement, perhaps for the eighth book of the Stromata; probably, however, for other writings. The *Protrepticus* may have been written before 189, the *Paedagogus* about 190, the *Stromata* about 200—202/203. Many of the numerous authors quoted by Clement were very probably known to him only through anthologies. In the acceptance and use of those Judaistic-Alexandrine forgeries which pretend to establish the intellectual priority of the Hebrews as compared with the Greeks, he showed himself credulous and uncritical. Wendland is of opinion that lengthy passages of the *Paedagogus* and the *Stromata* were borrowed from the Stoic Musonius, the teacher of Epictetus, or at least from the lectures of Musonius as represented by the notes of some student of that master. On the other hand Arnobius and Theodoret of Cyrus made extensive use of the writings of Clement.

The *Protrepticus* and the *Paedagogus* have reached us through the Arethas-Codex (§ 13) of A. D. 914, and some copies of the same; the *Stromata* through the Cod. Flor. Laurent. V 3 (saec. xi), and a copy of it. On the plan and nature of the entire work cf. *Overbeck*, in Histor. Zeitschr., new series (1882), xii. 454 ff. *D. Dragomeros*, Κλήμεντος Ἀλεξανδρέως ὁ προτρεπτικὸς πρὸς Ἕλληνας λόγος, Bucarest, 1890. *O. Staehlin*, Clemens Alexandrinus, i; Protrepticus und Paedagogus (Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller), Leipzig, 1905. *R. Taverni*, Sopra il παιδαγωγός di Tito Flavio Clemente Alessandrino, Rome, 1885.

For a German version of the *Protrepticus* and *Paedagogus* cf. *L. Hopfenmüller* and *J. Wimmer*, Kempten, 1875 (Bibliothek der Kirchenväter). The first of the two Hymns at the end of the *Paedagogus* was published in a carefully revised text by *W. Christ* and *M. Paranikas*, Anthologia graeca carminum christianorum, Leipzig, 1871, pp. 37 ff.; cf. xviii ff. For the chronological chapter in the *Stromata* (i. 21, 101—147) cf. the classical recension of *P. de Lagarde*, in Abhandlungen der k. Gesellsch. der Wissenschaften in Göttingen (1891), xxxvii. 73 ff. *W. Hozakowski*, De chronographia Clementis Alexandrini (Dissert. inaug.), Münster, 1896 (see n. 9). On the eighth book of the *Stromata (Excerpta ex Theodoto, Eclogae propheticae)* cf. *Zahn*, Forschungen zur Gesch. des neutestamentl. Kanons (1884), iii. 104—130; *P. Ruben*, Clementis Alexandrini excerpta ex Theodoto (Dissert. inaug.), Leipzig, 1892; *J. von Arnim*, De octavo Clementis Stromatorum libro (Progr.), Rostock, 1894; *O. Clausen*, Zur Stromateis des Clemens Alex. und ihrem Verhältnis zum Protrepticos und Paedagogos, in Zeitschr. für wissenschaftl. Theol. (1902), xlv. 465—512. There is an English translation, by *W. Wilson*, of the writings of Clement in Ante-Nicene Fathers (Am. ed. 1885), ii. 171—604. The hymns are translated by *W. Alexander*. *F. J. A. Hort* and *J. B. Mayor*, Clement of Alexandria, Miscellanies, book 7, Greek text with introduction, translation, notes, dissertations, and indices, London, 1903; *J. Bernays*, Zu Aristoteles und Clemens, 1864, reprinted in Gesammelte Abhandlungen von J. B., herausgegeben von *H. Usener*, Berlin, 1885, i. 151—164; *P. Wendland*, Quaestiones Musonianae. De Musonio stoico Clementis Alexandrini aliorumque auctore, Berlin, 1886; *Id.*, in Beiträge zur Gesch. der griech. Philosophie und Religion von *P. W.* und *O. Kern*, Berlin, 1895, pp. 68 ff.; *Id.*, Philo und Clemens Alexandrinus, in Hermes (1896), xxxi. 435—456; *Ad. Scheck*, De fontibus Clementis Alexandrini (Progr.), Augsburg, 1889; *W. Christ*,

Philologische Studien zu Clemens Alexandrinus, München, 1900 (Abhandlungen der kgl. bayr. Akad. der Wissensch.); *H. Jackson,* Notes on Clement of Alexandria (Stromata), in Journal of philology (1902), xxvii. 131—135.

*A. Röhricht,* De Clemente Alexandrino Arnobii in irridendo gentilium cultu deorum auctore (Progr.), Hamburg, 1893. *C. Roos,* De Theodoreto Clementis et Eusebii compilatore (Dissert. inaug.), Halle, 1883. *F. Schwartz,* Zu Clemens' Τίς ὁ σωζόμενος πλούσιος, in Hermes (1903), xxxviii. 75—100.

4. HYPOTYPOSES. The work entitled ὑποτυπώσεις (outlines, sketches) contained in eight books a brief commentary on the Scriptures, including the Letter of Barnabas and the Apocalypse of Peter. It was interspersed with excursus of a dogmatic or historical nature[1]. There are some Greek fragments of it in Eusebius, Photius, Oecumenius, and others, also in the so-called *Adumbrationes Clementis Alexandrini in epistulas canonicas.* This latter text is a Latin version of the commentary of Clement on the First Epistle of Peter, the Epistle of Jude, First and Second of John, made by order of Cassiodorus and cleansed of dogmatically offensive passages.

*Zahn,* Forschungen zur Gesch. des neutestamentl. Kanons, iii. 64—103 130—156; *Preuschen* (see n. 2), pp. 306 f., collated with a later codex *Zahn's* edition of the Adumbrationes (l. c., pp. 79—93); *G. Mercati,* i Un frammento delle ipotiposi di Clemente Alessandrino; ii: Paralipomena ambrosiana, con alcuni appunti sulle benedizioni del cereo pasquale, in Studi e Testi, Rome, 1904, n. 10.

5. QUIS DIVES SALVETUR. This little work (Who is the rich man that is saved?: τίς ὁ σωζόμενος πλούσιος), highly prized even in antiquity, is a Homily on Mk. x. 17—31. The Lord, says Clement, does not intend to exclude any rich man from the kingdom of heaven, he only commands us to mortify in spirit our attachment to the goods of this earth and to make good use of our possessions[2]. It must have been written shortly after the publication of the Stromata[3].

The *editio princeps* is that of *M. Ghisler,* Leyden, 1623; recent separate editions are owing to *W Br. Lindner,* Leipzig, 1861; *K. Köster,* Freiburg, 1893 (Sammlung ausgew. kirchen- und dogmengeschichtl. Quellenschriften, vi); *P. M. Barnard,* Cambridge, 1897 (Texts and Studies, v 2). Former editions were based on a Codex Vatican. (saec. xv); but Barnard discovered the archetype of this manuscript in Codex Scorial. (saec. xi). A German version of the Homily was made by *L. Hopfenmüller,* Kempten, 1875 (Bibl. der Kirchenväter). It was translated into English by *P. M. Barnard,* London, 1900.

6. WORKS KNOWN ONLY FROM QUOTATIONS AND FRAGMENTS. Clement had intended to write special works on various themes; we do not know that he was able to execute them. Thus it was his purpose to write on the resurrection: περὶ ἀναστάσεως[4]; on prophecy:

[1] *Eus.,* Hist. eccl., vi. 13, 2; 14, 1; *Phot.,* Bibl. Cod. 109.
[2] Cf. Paed., ii. 3; iii. 6. [3] Cf. c. 26 and Strom., iv. 1, 2—3.
[4] Paed., i. 6, 47; ii. 10, 104.

*περὶ προφητείας*, in defence of the inspiration of the biblical books and in opposition to Montanism[1]; on the soul: *περὶ ψυχῆς*, against Basilidians and Marcionites[2]; perhaps on Genesis, or the Creation: *εἰς τὴν γένεσιν*[3]. In the *Paedagogus*[4] he refers to a former work on continence: *περὶ ἐγκρατείας;* in the Quis Dives (c. 26) to his discussion on First Principles and on Theology *(ἀρχῶν καὶ θεολογίας ἐξήγησις)*. Wendland holds that in the first passage Clement has merely copied, and rather carelessly, the title of a work of the Stoic Musonius. It is true, however, that he announced in the Stromata[5] a work on the *ἀρχαί* and on *θεολογία*. Eusebius mentions four other works[6]: a) on Easter *(περὶ τοῦ πάσχα)*, occasioned by the homonymous work of Melito of Sardes and directed against the Quartodecimans of Asia Minor[7]; b) an Ecclesiastical Canon, against Judaizers: *κανὼν ἐκκλησιαστικὸς ἢ πρὸς τοὺς ἰουδαΐζοντας*[8]*;* c) Homilies on fasting and on calumny: *διαλέξεις περὶ νηστείας καὶ περὶ καταλαλιᾶς*[9]; d) an Exhortation to perseverance, or to the newly baptized: *ὁ προτρεπτικὸς πρὸς ὑπομονὴν ἢ πρὸς τοὺς νεωστὶ βεβαπτισμένους*[10] Some texts of the first two are found in later writers. Barnard believed (1897) that he had discovered a fragment of the fourth. — Palladius is the first to make mention[11] of a work on the prophet Amos: *εἰς τὸν προφήτην Ἀμώς.* A work on Providence: *περὶ προνοίας*, is first mentioned by Maximus Confessor, Anastasius Sinaita, and later writers.

*Zahn,* l. c., pp. 32—64; *Preuschen,* l. c., pp. 299—301 308—311 316; *Barnard,* Clement of Alex., «Quis dives salvetur», pp. 47—52.

7 DOCTRINE OF CLEMENT From the initial words of the *Stromata* (i. 1, 11—14) one might be tempted to believe that the whole work was nothing more than a written elaboration of the teaching that in former years Clement had heard from his instructors, and especially from Pantænus. It is very probable, however, that such words are only an exaggerated expression of his own modesty and of veneration for his earlier masters. Clement is frequently in conflict with ecclesiastical tradition, with which he undertakes to combine elements that are foreign to it. From Greek philosophy he borrows some far-reaching principles, first from the Stoics, and then from Plato, frequently through Philo. He is of opinion that philosophy, though its elements of truth are drawn from the Old Testament, should occupy an important role in the divine plan of redemption. As the Jews were

[1] Strom., i. 24, 158; iv. 1, 2, al. [2] Ib., ii. 20, 113; iii. 3, 13, al.
[3] *Eus.*, Hist. eccl., vi. 13, 8; cf. Strom., iii. 14, 95; vi. 18, 168.
[4] ii. 10, 94; cf. ii. 6, 52; iii. 8, 41. [5] iv. 1, 2—3; cf. iii. 3, 13, al.
[6] Cf. *Hier.*, De viris illustr., c. 38.
[7] *Eus.*, Hist. eccl., iv. 26, 4; vi. 13, 3 9. [8] Ib., vi. 13, 3.
[9] Ib. [10] Ib. [11] Hist. Lausiaca, c. 139.

led to Christ through the Law, so should the Gentiles come to Him through philosophy: *ἐπαιδαγώγει γὰρ καὶ αὐτὴ (ἡ φιλοσοφία) τὸ Ἑλληνικόν, ὡς ὁ νόμος τοὺς Ἑβραίους εἰς Χριστόν*[1]. Only by means of philosophy can the Christian advance from faith to knowledge, from *πίστις* to *γνῶσις*. Faith is, so to speak, a concise knowledge of what is necessary: *σύντομος τῶν κατεπειγόντων γνῶσις*, while science is a strong and assured demonstration of those truths that have been accepted by faith: *ἀπόδειξις τῶν διὰ πίστεως παρειλημμένων ἰσχυρὰ καὶ βέβαιος*[2]. To acquire knowledge without philosophy is like hoping to harvest grapes without caring for the vines[3]. How far Clement, under the guidance of philosophy, had fallen away from ecclesiastical doctrine, may be gathered from the severe judgment of Photius[4] on the *Hypotyposes* (§ 38, 4), a work in which Clement seems to have plunged more deeply into speculation than in any of his extant writings. «In some places», says Photius, «he holds firmly to the correct doctrine; elsewhere he is carried away by strange and impious notions. He asserts the eternity of matter, excogitates a theory of ideas from the words of Holy Scripture, and reduces the Son to a mere creature. He relates fabulous stories of a metempsychosis and of many worlds before Adam. Concerning the formation of Eve from Adam he teaches things blasphemous and scurrilous, and anti-scriptural. He imagines that the angels held intercourse with women and begot children from them, also that the Logos did not become man in reality but only in appearance. It even seems that he has a fabulous notion of two Logoi of the Father, of which the inferior one appeared to men; indeed, not even this one.»

*V Hébert-Duperron,* Essai sur la polémique et la philosophie de Clément d'Alexandrie, Paris, 1855. *J Cognat,* Clément d'Alexandrie, sa doctrine et sa polémique, Paris, 1859. *H. Preische,* De γνώσει Clementis Alexandrini (Dissert. inaug.), Jena, 1871. *Knittel,* Pistis und Gnosis bei Clemens von Alexandrien, in Theol. Quartalschr. (1873), lv 171—219 363—417. *C. Merk,* Clemens Alexandrinus in seiner Abhängigkeit von der griechischen Philosophie (Dissert. inaug.), Leipzig, 1879. *É. de Faye,* Clément d'Alexandrie, Etude sur les rapports du Christianisme et de la philosophie grecque au 2e siècle, Paris, 1898. *H. Laemmer,* Clementis Alexandrini de λόγῳ doctrina, Leipzig, 1855. *G. Th. Hillen,* Clementis Alex. de SS. Eucharistia doctrina (Dissert. inaug.), Warendorp, 1861. *G. Anrich,* Clemens und Origenes als Begründer der Lehre vom Fegfeuer (in Abhandlungen für *H. J. Holtzmann*), Tübingen, 1902. *P Ziegert,* Zwei Abhandlungen über T. Flavius Clemens Alexandrinus. Psychologie und Logoschristologie, Heidelberg, 1894. *V Pascal,* La foi et la raison dans Clément d'Alexandrie, Montdidier, 1901. *Funk,* Clemens von Alexandrien über Familie und Eigentum, in Theol. Quartalschr. (1871), liii. 427—449, and in Kirchengeschichtl. Abhandlungen und Untersuchungen (1899), ii. 45—60. *Fr. J. Winter,* Die Ethik des Clemens von Alexandrien, in Studien zur Gesch.

[1] Strom.. i. 5, 28; cf. vi. 17, 159. Cf. Gal. iii. 24.
[2] Strom., vii. 10, 57. [3] Ib., i. 9, 43. [4] Bibl. Cod. 109.

der christl. Ethik, i, Leipzig, 1882. *G. Basilakes,* Κλήμεντος τοῦ Ἀλεξανδρέως ἡ ἠθικὴ διδασκαλία (Dissert. inaug.), Erlangen, 1892. *K. Ernesti,* Die Ethik des Titus Flavius Clemens von Alexandrien oder die erste zusammenhängende Begründung der christlichen Sittenlehre, Paderborn, 1900. *Markgraf,* Clemens von Alexandrien als asketischer Schriftsteller in seiner Stellung zu den natürlichen Lebensgütern, in Zeitschr. für Kirchengesch. (1901—1902), xxii. 485—515. *N. Capitaine,* Die Moral des Clemens von Alexandrien, Paderborn, 1903. *W. Wagner,* Der Christ und die Welt nach Clemens von Alexandrien, ein noch unveraltetes Problem in altchristlicher Beleuchtung, Göttingen, 1903. *H. Eickhoff,* Das Neue Testament des Clemens Alexandrinus (Progr.), Schleswig, 1890. *P. Dausch,* Der neutestamentliche Schriftkanon und Clemens von Alexandrien, Freiburg, 1894. *H. Kutter,* Clemens Alexandrinus und das Neue Testament, Gießen, 1897. *P. M. Barnard,* The Biblical Text of Clement of Alexandria in the Four Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles, Cambridge, 1899 (Texts and Studies, v. 5). *O. Staehlin,* Clemens Alexandrinus und die Septuaginta (Progr.), Nürnberg, 1901. *Bratke,* Die Stellung des Clemens Alexandrinus zum antiken Mysterienwesen, in Theol. Studien und Kritiken, (1887), lx. 647 to 708, and *P. Ziegert,* ib. (1894), lxvii. 706—732. *W. Wagner,* Wert und Verwertung der griechischen Bildung im Urteil des Clemens von Alexandrien, in Zeitschr. für wissenschaftl. Theol. (1902), xlv. 213—262. *V. Kranich,* Qua via ac ratione Clemens Alex. ethnicos ad religionem christianam adducere studuerit, Braunsberg, 1903.

8. PANTÆNUS. He was born in Sicily according to Clement (Strom., i. 1, 11), became a Christian missionary in the East (India and Arabia), and was for many years president of the catechetical school of Alexandria (*Eus.,* Hist. eccl., v. 10). He died shortly before 200, and left no writings (*Clem.,* Strom., i. 1, 11—14; Eclog. 27). It is very probable that the assertion of Eusebius (Hist. eccl., v 10, 4), that Pantænus had left books of his own composition (συγγράμματα), and similar statements in more recent writers (Maximus Confessor, Anastasius Sinaita) are only a hasty inference from the fact that Clement often quotes expressions from Pantænus. Jerome attributes to him many Commentaries on Scripture, but he is doubtless re-iterating Eusebius (cf. De viris illustr., c. 36; Ep. 70, 4). The «testimonia» of the ancients concerning Pantænus are met with in *Routh,* Reliquiae sacrae, i. 373—383, and are reprinted in *Migne,* PG., v. 1327—1332, more fully in *Harnack,* Gesch. der altchristl. Literatur, i. 291—296; cf. particularly *Zahn,* Forschungen, iii. 156—176.

9. JUDAS. A certain Judas, otherwise unknown, probably an Alexandrine from what Eusebius says (Hist. eccl., vi. 7; cf. *Hier.,* De viris illustr., c. 52), wrote a work on the seventy weeks of Daniel: εἰς τὰς παρὰ τῷ Δανιὴλ ἑβδομάδας, in which he presented chronological reckonings as far as the tenth year of the reign of Septimius Severus (203) and announced the coming of Antichrist as imminent. Similar prophecies were made during the persecution of Septimius Severus (cf. *Hipp.,* Comm. in Dan., iv. 18 19). We only need mention the quite unsuccessful attempt of Schlatter who undertook to find in Clement (Strom., i. 21, 147) and in other writers traces of a Christian chronography made in the tenth year of Antoninus Pius (148). He hoped, by rejection of the dates of Eusebius, to identify this chronography with the above-mentioned work of Judas. — *A. Schlatter,* Der Chronograph aus dem zehnten Jahre Antonins (Texte und Untersuchungen, xii. 1), Leipzig, 1894. *Harnack,* Gesch. der altchristl. Literatur, i. 327 755 f.; ii. 1, 225 ff. 406 ff.

## § 39. Origen.

1. HIS LIFE AND WORKS. In the sixth book of his Church History, Eusebius relates at length the life and labors of Origen; of the great «Apology for Origen» composed in common by Eusebius and Pamphilus, we possess but a few small remnants. Similarly, the correspondence of the great theologian has perished, with the exception of a few pieces. He was born of Christian parents in 185 or 186, apparently at Alexandria. Probably it was only at a later period that the soubriquet Adamantius (Ἀδαμάντιος = Man of steel) was applied to him[1]. He owed his first training to his father Leonides, particularly an excellent religious formation[2]. At an early age he frequented the catechetical school of Alexandria, where he profited by the teaching of Clement[3]. Leonides suffered martyrdom in the persecution of Septimius Severus, 202 or 203; the ardent desire of Origen to share his father's fate was frustrated only by his mother's ingenuity[4]. Having lost its patrimony by confiscation, the family, a large one, was reduced to poverty. In the meantime Origen had attracted the attention of Demetrius, bishop of Alexandria, and in 203, when scarcely eighteen years of age, was called to the head-mastership of the catechetical school, as successor to Clement[5]. Until 215 or 216 he worked on at this calling, a tireless and influential man. So far as we know his teaching was at this time uninterrupted, save for a short time by journeys to Rome and to Arabia[6] It was during these years that ascetic zeal, roused by meditation on Mt. xix, 12, moved him to emasculate himself[7] To gain leisure for his own studies he took in as an associate teacher his former disciple Heraclas. He retained, however, the direction of the more advanced pupils[8]. Origen had probably reached his twenty-fifth year when he began to attend the lectures of Ammonius Saccas, the famous founder of Neoplatonism[9]; at the same time his zeal for biblical studies urged him to acquire a knowledge of Hebrew[10]. To this period also belong his first writings. The Alexandrine massacre perpetrated by Caracalla in 215 or 216, was the cause of Origen's flight to Palestine. Here Alexander, bishop of Jerusalem, and Theoctistus, bishop of Cæsarea, received him most honourably, and, though he was yet a layman, induced him to preach in their churches. Demetrius of Alexandria was dissatisfied with their conduct, and requested Origen to return without delay. The latter obeyed and once more took up his calling as teacher and writer[11]. Seven skilled amanuenses were placed at his disposal by Ambrose, a former disciple; they relieved one another in taking down the

[1] *Pamphilus-Eus*, in *Phot.*, Bibl. Cod. 118; *Hier.*, Ep. 33, 3.
[2] *Eus.*, Hist. eccl., vi. 2, 7. [3] Ib., vi. 6. [4] Ib., vi. 2, 5.
[5] Ib., vi. 3, 3. [6] Ib., vi. 14, 10; 19, 15. [7] Ib., vi. 8. [8] Ib., vi. 15.
[9] Ib., vi. 19. [10] Ib., vi. 16, 1. [11] Ib., vi. 19, 19.

master's dictation. As many copyists and some female calligraphers were also occupied in his service, — in a way this corps did duty as an Alexandrine press for the publication of his works[1]. About 230 he undertook, with a written recommendation from Demetrius[2], a journey to Athens in order to confer with certain heretics; on the way he stopped at Cæsarea in Palestine, where he was ordained priest[3] by his friends Alexander and Theoctistus; this without the knowledge of his bishop and in spite of his act of self-emasculation, for which step, on his return, Demetrius called him to account. He was deposed from his office as head-master by two synods held at Alexandria (231—232), because of his irregular ordination and his unecclesiastical teaching; he was also expelled from the city and degraded from the priesthood[4]. Shortly afterwards Demetrius died and Heraclas was chosen his successor, whereupon Origen returned to Alexandria, only to be again condemned and excommunicated by Heraclas for unecclesiastical teaching[5]. He now took up his permanent residence at Cæsarea, and established there a theological school that soon reached a high degree of efficiency[6]. One of its pupils, St. Gregory Thaumaturgus, has left us an interesting account of the method of instruction and the course of studies carried on by Origen at Cæsarea[7]. With the exception of a few journeys to Athens[8] and Arabia[9], in the service of the Church, he seems to have lived on in Cæsarea, constantly busy as teacher, writer and preacher, to the time of the Decian persecution. During that storm he was cast into prison, probably at Tyre, and underwent many tortures[10]. Not long after he died at Tyre[11], in 254 or 255, having completed his sixty-ninth year[12].

*P. D. Huetius*, Origenis in S. Scripturas commentaria, Rouen, 1668, i. 1—278. Origeniana (on the life, doctrine, and writings of Origen, three books), often reprinted, cf. *Migne*, PG., xvii. 633—1284. *E. R. Redepenning*, Origenes. Eine Darstellung seines Lebens und seiner Lehre, Bonn, 1841—1846, 2 voll. *E. Freppel*, Origène, Paris, 1868. 2 voll., 2. éd. 1875, 3. éd. 1886. *Fr. Böhringer*, Die griechischen Väter des 3. und 4. Jahrhunderts. i: Klemens und Origenes (Die Kirche Christi und ihre Zeugen, i. 2, 1) 2. ed. Zürich, 1869. *B. F Westcott*, Origenes, in Dictionary of Christ. Biogr. (1887), iv. 96—142. For Origen and Heraclas cf. *J. Döllinger*, Hippolytus und Kallistus, Ratisbon, 1853, 261 ff. *Preuschen*, Bibelzitate bei Origenes, in Zeitschr. für die neutestamentl. Wissensch. (1903), iv. 79—87 *F. A. Winter*, Über den Wert der direkten und indirekten Überlieferung von Origenes' Büchern *Contra Celsum* (Progr.), Burghausen, 1903, i. *D. Genet*, L'enseignement d'Origène sur la prière, Cahors (1903).

[1] Ib., vi. 23, 2. [2] *Hier.*, De viris illustr., cc. 54 62.
[3] *Eus.*, Hist. eccl., vi. 8, 4. [4] *Phot.*, Bibl. Cod. 118.
[5] *Phot.*, Collect. et demonstr., c. 9. [6] *Eus.*, Hist. eccl., vi. 30.
[7] Paneg. in Orig. cc. 7—15. [8] *Eus.*, Hist. eccl., vi. 32, 2.
[9] Ib., vi. 33, 37. [10] Ib., vi. 39, 5. [11] Ib., vii. 1.
[12] *Hier.*, De viris illustr., c. 54.

2. THE WORKS OF ORIGEN. The story told to Epiphanius[1] about the 6000 books *(βίβλους)* written by Origen was surely an exaggeration. The catalogue of his works given by Eusebius in his lost life of St. Pamphilus[2], did not contain, if we believe St. Jerome[3], 2000 titles, and the catalogue made by Jerome himself[4], most probably from that of Eusebius, does not mention in its actual shape more than 800 titles; it is, however, very defective, and perhaps does not exhibit a continuous text. It is certain that no ecclesiastical writer of the Ante-Nicene period equalled Origen in literary productivity We possess to-day but a small remnant of his works; and of these fully one half have reached us, not in the original Greek, but in Latin versions. Eminent writers like Jerome and Rufinus were his translators, while Basil the Great and Gregory of Nazianzus co-operated in producing an elegant florilegium of his works known as the Philocalia or *(Ὠριγένους φιλοκαλία)*. Whole classes of his writings perished as the result of the inimical edict of Justinian (543), the adverse judgment of the Fifth General Council (553), and the attitude of the so-called Gelasian Decretal *de libris recipiendis et non recipiendis*. Origen cultivated with special zeal the field of biblical text-criticism and exegesis, he wrote commentaries, not once, but often and in various forms, on the greater part of the Scriptures. At the same time he wrote a series of apologetic, polemical, dogmatic and ascetical works — in a word, he outlined the entire field of theology. He was the first to construct a philosophico-theological system, at once uniform and comprehensive. All the theological movements and schools belonging to the patristic period of the Greek Church are grouped about Origen as about a common centre of union or divergency. He does not belong to the first rank of stylists, being not only very prolix in the treatment of his subject, but also diffuse and pedantic in expression; — defects that are probably owing to his uninterrupted oral teaching. Many of his writings were not genuine literary labors, but ephemeral performances, dictations[5], or oral discourses copied by his hearers[6].

*Preuschen*, in *Harnack*, Gesch. der altchristl. Lit., i. 332—405. The existing editions of St. Jerome's works give Ep. 33, only in fragmentary form (cf. *Migne*, PL., xxii. 446 ff.). The catalogues of the works of Varro and Origen were first published by *Fr. Ritschl* in 1848, and again in 1849. It is on his labors that the attempts of Redepenning and Pitra to reconstruct Ep. 33 Jerome are based. For *Redepenning*, see Zeitschr. für die histor. Theol. (1851), xxi. 66—79, and for *Pitra*, Spicil. Solesm. (1855), iii. 311—317. With the help of new codices *E. Klostermann*, in Sitzungsberichte der k. preuß. Akad. der Wissensch., Berlin 1897, pp. 855—870, undertook to reconstruct the catalogue of the works of Origen. The Greek text of the *Philocalia Origenis* of Basil the Great and Gregory of Nazianzus

[1] Haer. 64, 63. [2] *Eus.*, Hist. eccl., vi. 32, 3. [3] Adv. Rufin., ii. 22.
[4] Ep. 33. [5] *Eus.*, Hist. eccl., vi. 23, 2. [6] Ib., vi. 36, 1.

was first edited by *J. Tarinus*, Paris, 1619, and recently by *J. A. Robinson*, Cambridge, 1893. It is also to be found in the editions of Origen (e. g. in *Migne*, PG., xiv. 1309—1316). The first complete editions of Origen, those of *J. Merlin*, Paris, 1512, and *G. Genebrard*, Paris, 1574, both of which have often been reprinted, furnish only a Latin version, even for those writings the Greek text of which has reached us. The Maurist savants, *Charles de la Rue* and his nephew *Charles Vincent de la Rue*, were the first to bring out a complete edition of Origen, with the exception of the fragments of the Hexapla, Paris, 1733—1759, 4 voll. It was reproduced in abbreviated form by *Fr. Oberthür*, Würzburg, 1780—1794, 15 voll. The edition of *C. H. E. Lommatzsch*, Berlin 1831—1848, 25 voll., is a much more original and complete work. The Maurist edition, with numerous additions (Hexapla, Philosophumena, Supplementum ad Origenis Exegetica) is reprinted in *Migne*, PG., xi—xvii. A new edition of the works of Origen is now appearing in the Berlin Collection of early ecclesiastical Greek writers. Origenes' Werke i—ii, herausgegeben von *P. Koetschau*, Leipzig, 1899. Cf. *Koetschau*, Kritische Bemerkungen zu meiner Ausgabe von Origenes' Exhortatio, Contra Celsum, De oratione, Leipzig, 1899, also *Koetschau*, in Zeitschr. für wissensch. Theol. (1900), xliii. 321—377; vol. iii., edited by *E. Klostermann*, contains the homilies on the Prophecy of Jeremiah, the commentaries on the Lamentations, and the exposition of the Book of Kings, Berlin, 1901; vol. iv. Origenes' Johannes-Kommentar, edited by *E. Preuschen*, Berlin, 1903.

3. CRITICAL WORKS ON THE BIBLE. In the gigantic enterprise known as the Hexapla, now lost, Origen set himself the task of making clear at a glance the relation of the Septuagint to the original Hebrew text; he thereby hoped to establish a solid foundation for his theological interpretation of Scripture, and particularly for his polemic against the Jews[1]. For this purpose he copied in parallel columns, first the Hebrew text in Hebrew letters, then the Hebrew text in Greek letters. Then followed in four other columns the Greek versions of Aquila, Symmachus, the Septuagint, and Theodotion. In the text of the Septuagint he marked with an obelus or cancel the words, verses or chapters that were lacking in the original Hebrew. The «lacunae» or gaps in the Septuagint text which were indicated by an asterisk were filled up from one of the other versions, mostly from Theodotion's. For some books of the Old Testament he added a fifth version, and for the Psalms a fifth, sixth and seventh[2]. From its six columns the work was known as Hexapla (ἑξαπλᾶ, sc γράμματα) or six-fold writing. This great enterprise, begun at Alexandria, is said to have been finished at Tyre; therefore, towards the end of his life[3] Very probably no second copy was ever made of the entire work. The fifth column (Hexaplar recension of the Septuagint) was often copied, and we still possess some fragments of its Greek text. The greater part of it has also reached us in a Syriac version, slavishly literal, made in 616 or 617, by Paul, bishop

[1] *Orig.*, Comm. in Matth., xv. 14.

[2] *Eus.*, Hist. eccl., vi. 16; *Hier.*, Comm. in Titum ad iii. 9.

[3] *Epiph.*, De mens. et pond., c. 18.

of Tella. Origen prepared also a work known as the Tetrapla[1], a collation of the four principal Greek versions of the Old Testament, those namely of Aquila, Symmachus, the Septuagint, and Theodotion. It has utterly perished. There is no foundation for the opinion of Hug that Origen undertook a revision or recension of the text of the New Testament.

The fragments of the Hexapla were collected by *B. de Montfaucon,* Paris, 1713, 2 voll. (cf. *Migne,* PG., xv—xvi) and *Fr. Field,* Oxford, 1867 to 1875, 2 voll. More important than the appendices of *J. B. Pitra* (1884) and *E. Klostermann* (1894) is the yet unpublished discovery by *G. Mercati* of a Hexapla fragment of the Psalms. *G. Mercati,* Un palinsesto ambrosiano dei Salmi Esapli, Turin, 1896, in Atti della R. Accademia delle Scienze di Torino. The same writer has also made important contributions to the history and text of the Hexapla, in Note di letteratura biblica e cristiana antica (Studi e Testi v), Rome, 1901, i (pp. 1—7): Una congettura sopra il libro del Giusto; ii (pp. 8—16). Sul testo ebraico del Salmo 140 (141); iii (pp. 17—27): Sul canone biblico di S. Epifanio; iv (pp. 28—46): D'alcuni frammenti esaplari sulla v[a] e vi[a] edizione greca della Bibbia (there is laid claim, for the Hexapla, by interior and exterior reasons, to some few lines of this iv. part; they are entitled περὶ τῆς ε' καὶ ς' ἐκδόσεως ἄλλως: *Migne,* PG., lxxxiv. 29); v (pp. 47—60): Sul testo et sul senso di *Eusebio,* Hist. eccl., vi. 16. *J. Halévy,* L'origine de la transcription du texte hébreu en caractères grecs dans les Hexaples d'Origène, in Journal asiatique, ser. ix (1901), xviii. 335—341. Halévy was opposed by *J. B. Chabot,* ib. 349—350; and replied ib. (1902), xix. 134—136 140—144; *C. Taylor,* Hebrew-Greek Cairo Genizah Palimpsests from the Taylor-Schechter collection, including a fragment of the 22. Psalm according to Origen's Hexapla, Cambridge, 1901. The Syriac version is of very great importance for the reconstruction of the Hexaplar text of the Septuagint; the second half of a complete copy of that version was published in photolithograph by *A. M. Ceriani* (Monum. sacra et prof. ex. codd. praes. bibl. Ambrosianae, Milan, 1874, vii.); the other extant fragments were published by *P. de Lagarde,* Bibl. Syriaca, Göttingen, 1892, pp. 1—256. In general, for the history of the Hexapla, see the introductions to the Old Testament. The theory of Hug is refuted by Hundhausen, in *Wetzer* und *Welte,* Kirchenlexikon, 2. ed., ii. (1883), 700.

4. BIBLICO-EXEGETICAL WRITINGS. His exegetical writings may be divided into three groups: scholia, homilies and commentaries. The scholia *(σχόλια* or *σημειώσεις),* called *excerpta* by Jerome and Rufinus, are brief notes on the more difficult passages or the more obscure words. The homilies *(ὁμιλίαι, homiliae, tractatus),* are sermons on select chapters of the Bible. The commentaries *(τόμοι, volumina, libri)* are detailed and often exhaustive studies, illustrative of the biblical text. Unlike the more popular homilies, they contain philosophico-theological disquisitions, by means of which the more intelligent readers may discover the deeper truths of Scripture[2]. Origen wrote *scholia* on Exodus and Leviticus[3], also on Numbers[4]. Some

[1] *Eus.,* Hist. eccl., vi. 16, 44; *Epiph.,* De mens. et pond., c. 19.
[2] *Hier.,* Interpr. hom. Orig. in Ezech., prol. [3] Cf. Catal. in *Hier.* Ep. 33.
[4] *Rufin.,* Interpr. hom. Orig. in Num., prol.

fragments of these may yet be discovered in the Catenae. Some fragments of the scholia on Exodus are met with in the Philocalia (c. 27)[1]. His *scholia* on Numbers were, partially at least, included by Rufinus in his translation of the homilies of Origen on Numbers[2]. Origen also wrote homilies on all the books of the Pentateuch[3], after 244 on the first four books, on Deuteronomy about 233. Of their Greek text only fragments remain[4], though they might be considerably increased by a more careful search in the Catenae. In the meantime there are extant in the version or paraphrase of Rufinus seventeen homilies on Genesis[5], thirteen on Exodus[6], sixteen on Leviticus[7], twenty-eight on Numbers[8]. It was also the intention of Rufinus to translate those on Deuteronomy, of which the catalogue numbers thirteen[9]. Beside the seventeen homilies on Genesis the catalogue of his works mentions *mysticarum homiliarum libros 2,* which also dealt with Genesis[10], but of which we have no more exact knowledge. It is possible that the homily on Melchisedech quoted by Jerome[11] was one of them. Finally he composed a commentary on Genesis, probably in thirteen books, the first eight of which were written at Alexandria, the others at Cæsarea[12]. He did not get beyond Gen. v. 1[13]. Only a few fragments of it are extant[14], mostly citations in the *Philocalia* (c. 14 23) from the third book. It seems that on the historical books of the Old Testament Origen delivered or wrote only homilies. Rufinus translated[15] twenty-six homilies on Josue that were probably delivered during the persecution of Decius[16] A Greek fragment of the twentieth homily is found in the Philocalia (c. 12); in 1894, Klostermann discovered notable remnants of the first four and the last eleven in the Octateuch-Catena of the sophist Procopius of Gaza. There exists a Latin version made by Rufinus[17] of nine homilies on Judges[18] mentioned about 235 by Origen himself. Between these nine and the four on the first book of Kings the Catalogue places eight homilies *De pascha,* a title that seems enigmatic if only by reason of its position. Two homilies on the first book of Kings have been preserved, one on 1 Kings i.—ii., in a Latin version of unknown origin[19], the other in the original Greek, on 1 Kings xxviii., or concerning the witch of Endor (*περὶ τῆς ἐγγαστριμύθου*)[20]. Cassiodorus mentions[21] a homily

[1] *Migne,* PG., xii. 263—282. [2] *Rufin.,* l. c.
[3] *Orig.,* Hom. 8 in Luc. [4] *Migne,* PG., xii. 161—168 353—354, al.
[5] Ib., xii. 145—162. [6] Ib,, xii. 297—396.
[7] Ib., xii. 405—574. [8] Ib., xii. 583—806. [9] *Rufin.,* l. c.
[10] *Rufin.,* Apol., ii. 20. [11] Ep. 73, 2. [12] *Eus.,* Hist. eccl., vi. 24, 2.
[13] *Orig.,* Contra Cels., vi. 49; cf. *Hier.,* Ep. 36, 9.
[14] *Migne,* PG., xii. 45—92. [15] Ib., xii. 823—948.
[16] Hom. in Ios., ix. 10. [17] *Migne,* PG., xii. 951—990.
[18] *Orig.,* Prolog. in Cant., in *Migne,* PG., xiii. 78. [19] Ib., xii. 995—1012.
[20] Ib., xii. 1011—1028. [21] Inst., i. 2.

on 2 Kings, one on the second book of Paralipomenon[1], a homily respectively on the first and second book of Esdras; all translated[2] by his friend Bellator. The twenty-two homilies on Job found a Latin epitomator in Hilary of Poitiers[3], but of this epitome only two small fragments remain[4], and remnants of the Greek text seem to be still found in the Catenae. — Origen treated the Psalms in all three of the above-mentioned ways[5]. The Catalogue mentions scholia on Psalms 1—15, and on the whole Psalter, also homilies on various Psalms. In all he wrote 120 homilies on 63 Psalms. He also wrote forty-six books of commentaries on forty-one Psalms. Elsewhere Jerome speaks[6] of a commentary on Ps. 126, and a *tractatus Phe literae*, probably an explanation of the verses of Psalm 118 that began with the Hebrew letter ה. Eusebius mentions an explanation of Psalms 1—25 written when Origen was still resident in Alexandria[7] Apart from an endless lot of fragments in the Catenae there is extant but very little of the Greek text of his various writings on the Psalms. There exist, however, in a Latin version of Rufinus, nine homilies, five on Psalm 36, two on Psalm 37, and two on Psalm 38; they date approximately from 240—245[8]. In his own commentary on the Psalms, Hilary of Poitiers made an extensive use of the labors of Origen[9]. In his above-mentioned Catalogue Jerome sets down seven homilies on Proverbs, a commentary in three books, a *De proverbiorum quibusdam quaestionibus librum 1;* fragments of which have reached us almost only through the Catenae. It seems that the scholia and eight homilies on Ecclesiastes are altogether lost. An elegant version of St. Jerome[10] has preserved the two homilies on the Canticle of canticles. In the Philocalia (c. 7, 1) has been saved a fragment, taken from some otherwise unknown youthful work of Origen on the Canticle of canticles[11]. Besides some Greek Catenæ-fragments of his commentary on the latter book, we possess the prologue, the first three books and a part of the fourth, in a Latin version by Rufinus[12]. This commentary was originally in ten books; five of them he wrote at Athens about 240, and the others shortly after, at Cæsarea[13]. Of these commentaries Jerome said[14]: *Origenes, cum in ceteris libris omnes vicerit, in Cantico canticorum ipse se vicit.* On the prophet Isaias he also wrote *scholia*, homilies and a commentary[15]. The homilies were apparently twenty-five in number[16]; nine of them

[1] *Cass.*, Inst., i. 2. [2] Ib., i. 6.
[3] *Hier.*, Ep. 61, 2; De viris illust., c. 100. [4] *Migne*, PL., x. 723—724.
[5] *Hier.*, Comm. in Psalm., prol. [6] Ep. 34, 1.
[7] *Eus.*, Hist. eccl., vi. 24, 2. [8] *Migne*, PG., xii. 1319—1410.
[9] *Hier.*, Ep. 61, 2; De viris illustr., c. 100. [10] *Migne*, PG., xiii. 35—58.
[11] Ib., xiii. 35—66. [12] Ib., xiii., 61—198.
[13] *Eus.*, Hist. eccl., vi. 32, 2. [14] Interpr. hom. Orig. in Cant., prol.
[15] *Hier.*, Comm. in Is., prol. [16] Ib.

have reached us in a Latin translation by Jerome, who purged them of heterodox sentiments[1]. The commentary on Isaias was composed at Cæsarea about 235, and dealt in thirty books with the text to Is. xxx. 5[2]. A few small fragments of it are found in the text of Pamphilus[3]. Two books on the vision in Isaias xxx. 6 ff. were held by Jerome to be spurious[4]. — An Escurial codex of the twelfth century has preserved for us the Greek text of nineteen homilies on Jeremias[5], delivered by Origen after 244; also fourteen, in a Latin version by Jerome[6] Twelve of the Latin homilies (1 2 4 8—14 16 17) are found also in Greek. The other two (20 21) are wanting in the Greek text of the manuscript. Cassiodorus was acquainted with forty-five homilies on Jeremias[7], and the Philocalia contains (cc. 1 10) two fragments of the thirty-ninth homily on that prophet[8]. — Origen composed at Alexandria a commentary on the Lamentations, five books of which were known to Eusebius[9]. Maximus Confessor cites a tenth book of the same[10], but the only fragments saved are apparently those in the Catenae. Of the homilies on Jeremias, delivered after those on Ezechiel[11], fourteen have reached us in a Latin version of Jerome, who removed from them the doctrinal errors[12]. Origen also began at Cæsarea and finished at Athens, about 240, a commentary on Ezechiel in twenty-five books[13] A fragment of the 20. book is met with in the Philocalia (c. 11)[14] The ancients say nothing of any work on Daniel. After 244, Origen wrote at Cæsarea a commentary on the twelve minor prophets, of which Eusebius[15] could find «only twenty-five books»[16] The Catalogue of Origen's works mentions commentaries on all the minor prophets, with the exception of Abdias. The only known fragment preserved is from the commentary on Osee in Philocalia c. 8[17]. He wrote a special opuscule on the pretended mystic sense of the word «Ephraim» in Osee[18] The Gospel of St. Matthew was illustrated by Origen with *scholia*, twenty-five homilies and a commentary in twenty-five books[19] The commentary was composed at Cæsarea[20] after 244. The original Greek is still extant in part (books 10 to 17, on Mt. xiii. 36 to xxii. 33)[21] A still larger portion (Mt. xvi. 13

[1] *Migne*, PG., xiii. 219—254. [2] *Eus.*, Hist. eccl., vi. 32, 1.
[3] Apol. pro Orig., cc. 5 7; *Migne*, PG., xiii. 217—220.
[4] *Hier.*, Comm. in Is., prol. [5] *Migne*, PG., xiii. 256—526.
[6] Ib., xiii. 255—542. [7] Inst., i. 3.
[8] *Migne*, PG., xiii. 541—544. [9] Hist. eccl., vi. 24, 2.
[10] Schol. in Dion. Areop., in *Migne*, PG., iv. 549.
[11] *Orig.*, Hom. in Ezech., xi. 5. [12] *Migne*, PG., xiii. 665—768.
[13] *Eus.*, Hist. eccl., vi. 32, 1—2. [14] *Migne*, PG., xiii. 663—666.
[15] Hist. eccl., vi. 36, 2. [16] *Hier.*, De viris ill., c. 75.
[17] *Migne*, PG., xiii. 825—828. [18] *Hier.*, Comm. in Hos., prol.
[19] *Hier.*, Comm. in Matth., prol. [20] *Eus.*, Hist. eccl., vi. 36, 2.
[21] *Migne*, PG., xiii. 835—1600.

to xxvii. 63) exists in an ancient anonymous Latin recension[1] There are also a few scattered fragments of the commentary on St. Matthew[2]. Nothing is known of Origen's labors on St. Mark. Jerome translated thirty-nine homilies on St. Luke, that may have been delivered shortly after 233[3] The Catenae have preserved numerous fragments of these homilies, that apparently numbered more than thirty-nine[4]. He wrote also a commentary on St. Luke in five books, but it is lost with the exception of some Catenae-fragments[5] — For St. John the Catalogue enumerates scholia and a commentary in thirty-two books[6]; of this commentary, besides small fragments of various books, the Greek text of the following books 1 2 6 10 13 19 (incomplete) 20 28 32 has been saved for us by a Munich Codex of the twelfth or thirteenth century[7]. The first five books were written at Alexandria, it is thought before the year 228[8]; but in the time of the persecution of Maximinus (235 to 238) the work was still unfinished[9]; very probably it originally consisted of more than thirty-two books[10] — Of the seventeen homilies on the Acts of the Apostles we know only one fragment of the fourth preserved in the *Philocalia* (c. 7, 2)[11]. We possess the fifteen books of the commentary (written after 244) on the Epistle to the Romans, but in a Latin recension in ten books, made by Rufinus[12]. His copy of the original Greek of this commentary contained a text both incomplete and corrupt; moreover it was on a Latin version of the Epistle to the Romans that Rufinus based his exposition. The Catalogue mentions eleven homilies on the Second Epistle to the Corinthians, but probably we ought to read the First Epistle[13]; there are Catenae-fragments of homilies on the latter. On the Epistle to the Galatians he wrote *scholia*[14], seven homilies and five books of a commentary; fragments of the first book of the commentary are quoted by Pamphilus[15]. In his commentary on this Epistle, St. Jerome follows Origen closely[16]. He made a still more copious use of the text of Origen in his commentary on the Epistle to the Ephesians[17] Origen had written a commentary on the latter in three books; Greek fragments, of which some are lengthy,

[1] *Migne*, PG., xiii. 993—1800. [2] Ib., xiii. 829—834.
[3] Ib., xiii. 1799—1902.
[4] *Orig.*, Comm. in Matth., xiii. 29; Comm. in Io., xxxii. 2.
[5] *Hier.*, Interpr. hom. Orig. in Luc., prol. — The Catalogue mentions 15 books.
[6] *Hier.*, Interpr. hom. Orig. in Luc., prol. — In *Eus.*, Hist. eccl., vi. 24, 1, for 22 it should be read 32. (ΝΒ΄)
[7] *Migne*, PG., xiv. 21—830. [8] Comm. in Io. i. 4; vi. 1.
[9] *Eus.*, Hist. eccl., vi. 28. [10] *Orig.*, Comm. in Matth. ser., c. 133.
[11] *Migne*, PG., xiv. 829—832. [12] Ib., xiv. 831— 1294.
[13] *Hier*, Ep. 49, 3.
[14] Cf. the Catalogue, and *Hier.*, Comm. in Gal., prol.; Ep. 112, 4.
[15] Apol. pro Orig., c. 5; *Migne*, PG., xiv. 1293—1298. [16] *Hier.*, ll. cc.
[17] *Hier.*, Comm. in Epiph., prol.; Adv. Rufin., i. 16, 21; iii. 11.

are met with in the Catenae, also a Latin fragment in Jerome[1]. According to the Catalogue he wrote a commentary in one book on the Epistle to the Philippians, and one in two books on the Epistle to the Colossians, while Pamphilus[2] quotes a passage from a third book of that commentary. Similarly, the Catalogue mentions a commentary in three books on the first Epistle to the Thessalonians, a long fragment of which is quoted by St. Jerome[3]. He also wrote a commentary in one book on the Second Epistle to Thessalonians. The same Catalogue indicates two homilies on *Epist. ad Thess.* without distinguishing to which one they belong. He wrote a homily and a commentary in one book on the Epistle to Titus; Pamphilus[4] cites five fragments from it. The same writer has also preserved[5] a fragment of a commentary in one book on the Epistle to Philemon. It would seem that the only remnants of the eight homilies on the Epistle to the Hebrews are two quotations in Eusebius[6]. Though, strangely enough, the Catalogue says nothing of a commentary on Hebrews; Pamphilus[7] quotes four passages from it. There is no indication in the Catalogue of any treatises on the Catholic Epistles or on the Apocalypse. It is certain, however, that Origen intended to write a commentary on the latter[8].

A new edition of the exegetical works of Origen will need to sift with more care than has hitherto been used the Catenae-fragments frequently referred to in the preceding pages. There must be a sifting of the genuine from the spurious; as far as possible, each genuine passage must also be traced back to its proper source. Many such fragments are found in the *De la Rue* edition (*Migne,* xii—xiii, passim). Additions were made by *Gallandi* and *Mai* (*Migne,* xvii. 9—370: Supplementum ad Origenis Exegetica). In his Analecta sacra, ii. 335—345 349—483; iii. 1 to 588, *Pitra* published recently from Vatican Catenae lengthy fragments on the Old Testament (Octateuch, Job, Psalms, Proverbs, the Prophets). Cf. *Fr. Loofs* in Theol. Literaturzeitung 1884, pp. 459—463. For fragments of New Testament Catenae see especially *J. A. Cramer,* Catenae graecorum Patrum in Nov. Test., Oxford, 1838—1844, 8 voll. On the Catenae in general cf. *Preuschen* in *Harnack,* l. c., 403—405 835—842. On the extracts from the homilies on Josue found in Procopius of Gaza see *E. Klostermann* in Texte und Untersuchungen, Leipzig, 1894, xii. 3, 2. The homily on 1 Kings, c. xxviii (the Witch of Endor), was re-edited (1886) with the reply of St. Eustathius of Antioch by *A. Jahn,* l. c., ii. 4. Origen's commentary on the Canticle of canticles is dealt with by *W. Riedel,* Die Auslegung des Hohenliedes, Leipzig, 1898, pp. 52—66. The text-tradition of the homilies on Jeremias is illustrated by *E. Klostermann,* in Texte und Untersuchungen (1897), xvi., new series, i. 3. For the ideas of Origen on the Book of Daniel as gathered from writings, extant or lost, in the commentary of St. Jerome on Daniel, cf. *J. Lataix,* Le commen-

[1] *Hier.,* Adv. Rufin., i. 28. [2] Apol. pro Orig., c. 5.
[3] Ep. 119, 9—10; cf. *Orig.,* Contra Cels., ii. 65.
[4] Apol. pro Orig., cc. 1 9. [5] Ib., c. 6.
[6] Hist. eccl., vi. 25, 11—14. [7] Apol. pro Orig., cc. 3 5.
[8] Comm. in Matth., ser. c. 49.

taire de St. Jérôme sur Daniel II, opinions d'Origène, in Revue d'hist. et de littérat. religieuses (1897), ii. 268—275. On the Greek fragments of the homilies on St. Luke edited by *A. Thenn* in Zeitschr. für wissensch. Theol. (1891—1893) cf. *J. Sickenberger*, in Theol. Quartalschr. (1896), lxxviii. 188—191. For a new edition of the remnants of the commentary on St. John we are indebted to *A. E. Brooke*, Cambridge, 1896, 2 voll. *J. A. F. Gregg*, The commentary of Origen upon the Epistle to the Ephesians, in Journal of Theological Studies (1902), iii. 233—234 398—420 554—576, began a republication of that commentary; its fragments had already been collected by Cramer from the Catenae. For the *Tractatus Origenis de libris SS. Scripturarum* edited by *Batiffol* and *Wilmart* in 1900 cf. § 55, 4. Concerning the canon of the Old Testament in Origen see *J. P. van Kasteren*, in Revue biblique (1901), x. 412—423. *E. Preuschen*, Bibelzitate bei Origenes, in Zeitschr. für die neutestamentl. Wissensch. (1903), iv. 79—87 The general character of his homilies is discussed by *Redepenning*, Origenes, ii. 212—261. Cf. *Westcott*, in Dict. of Christ. Biogr., iv. 104—118, where the reader will find a good index of the contents of the homilies and commentaries. There is a German version of some homilies by *F. A. Winter*, in *G. Leonhardi*, Die Predigt in der Kirche, Leipzig, 1893, xxii. *C. Jenkins*, The Origen-Citations in Cramer's Catena on 1 Corinthians, Journal of Theological Studies (1904), vi. 113—116.

5. GENERAL ESTIMATE OF HIS BIBLICAL WRITINGS. — It is principally the mystic sense of the Scriptures that Origen seeks to exhibit in his exegetical works; the historical sense he almost entirely neglects[1]. Guided by the analogy of Plato's trichotomous division of man he felt obliged to distinguish in the Scriptures a triple sense: somatic, psychic and pneumatic[2]. Practically, his theory would not work. And so, in view of the division of the Cosmos into flesh and spirit (*αἰσθητά* and *νοητά*), he was wont to distinguish in the Scriptures a carnal and a spiritual sense[3]. His fatal error was the total abandonment or denial, in many places, of the literal or historical sense, in favor of the spiritual sense[4] There are, he maintained, in the Holy Scriptures repulsive and scandalous and impossible sayings (*σκάνδαλα καὶ προσκόμματα καὶ ἀδύνατα*), the carnal interpretation of which is intolerable; when interpreted spiritually, however, they are seen to be only the integuments of deep mysteries[5] Even the Evangelists frequently set forth pneumatic truth in somatic falsehood[6] (*σωζομένου πολλάκις τοῦ ἀληθοῦς πνευματικοῦ ἐν τῷ σωματικῷ, ὡς ἂν εἴποι τις, ψευδεῖ*). It must be admitted that Origen possessed a certain knowledge of Hebrew, though it did not excede very modest limits[7]. For the comparison of the Septuagint and the original Hebrew he was always dependent upon the authority of others. Indeed, the dominant idea of the Hexapla is their apo-

[1] *Hier.*, Comm. in Mal., prol.
[2] De princ., iv, 11; Hom. in Levit., v. 1 5.
[3] Hom. in Levit., i. 1; Comm. in Jo., x. 4.
[4] Hom. in Gen. ii. 6; De princ, iv. 12. [5] De princ., iv. 15.
[6] Comm. in Jo., x. 4. [7] Hom. in Gen., xii. 4; Hom. in Num., xiv. 1,

logetic usefulness, rather than the gain of textual criticism. He was all the less inclined to entertain the idea of a critical study of the Septuagint translation on the basis of the original Hebrew, since he was persuaded that the text of the Septuagint was divinely inspired[1]. Its obscurities and solecisms are to him signs of special mysteries. When he detects a variation from the Hebrew text or from New Testament quotations, he prefers to admit falsification of the original Hebrew by the Jews, or a corruption of the manuscripts of the New Testament, rather than to acknowledge an error on the part of the Septuagint.

*Redepenning,* Origenes, i. 232—324; cf. ii. 156—188. *A. Zöllig,* Die Inspirationslehre des Origenes. Ein Beitrag zur Dogmengeschichte (Straßburger theolog. Studien, v. 1), Freiburg i. Br. 1902.

6. WORKS AGAINST PAGANS AND JEWS. — An apologetic work in eight books against Celsus (*κατὰ Κέλσου, contra Celsum*) has been preserved in a Vatican codex of the thirteenth century[2]; the *Philocalia* has also preserved lengthy fragments of it, equal in size to about one seventh of the whole work. Celsus, a Platonic eclectic, had published about 178 a work entitled «Veracious Demonstration» *(ἀληθὴς λόγος).* From Origen's refutation of the work we gather that in the first part the author attacked Christianity, in the person of a Jew who took his stand upon the racial faith in the Messias; in the second part he undertook to show the hopelessness of the Messianic idea and thereby to overthrow the cornerstone of Christianity; in the third part he assailed certain specific Christian doctrines, while in the fourth he defended the state-religion of the heathens. As is stated in the preface, the refutation of this work was written by Origen at the request of his friend Ambrose, during the reign of Philippus Arabs[3], probably in 248, and follows sentence by sentence the text of the »Demonstration». It falls, therefore, prescinding from the long introduction (i. 1—27), into four parts that correspond with the division of the work of Celsus (i. 28 to ii. 79; iii to v; vi. 1 to vii. 61; vii. 62 to viii. 71). Both in ancient[4] and modern times, it has been pronounced the most perfect apologetic work of the primitive Church. At least, Origen has nowhere exhibited greater learning. His calm attitude and dignified diction, the natural outcome of a sense of intellectual superiority, affects the reader favorably when compared with the passionate invectives of his opponent. In this same work[5] Origen refers to a discussion with some learned Jews in presence of several legal arbiters. It was probably reduced to writing, but we have no more accurate knowledge concerning it.

[1] Comm. in Cant. i.; *Migne,* PG., xiii. 93. [2] *Migne,* PG., xi. 641—1632.
[3] *Eus.,* Hist. eccl., vi. 36, 2. [4] *Eus.,* Adv. Hierocl. c. 1.
[5] Contra Celsum i. 45.

*P. Koetschau,* Die Überlieferung der Bücher des Origenes gegen Celsus, in Texte und Untersuchungen, Leipzig, 1889, vi. 1; cf. *F. Wallis* in The Classical Review (1889), iii. 392—398; *J. A. Robinson* in The Journal of Philology (1890), xviii. 288—296. The editio *princeps* (Greek text) is that of *D. Höschel,* Augsburg, 1605. A new edition has been prepared by *Koetschau,* Leipzig, 1899 (Die griech. christl. Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrh., Origenes I—II; see § 39, 2). A German translation was made by *J. Röhm,* Kempten, 1876—1877, 2 voll. (Bibl. der Kirchenväter). *K. J. Neumann,* Der römische Staat und die allgemeine Kirche, Leipzig 1900, i. 265—273 (treats of the time and occasion of its composition). *J. Patrick,* The apology of Origen in reply to Celsus, London, 1892. See also the literature relative to the work of Celsus. *Th. Keim,* Celsus' Wahres Wort, Zürich, 1873. *B. Aubé,* Hist. des persécutions de l'Église, ii. La polémique païenne à la fin du II[e] siècle, 2. ed., Paris, 1878. *E. Pélagaud,* Celse, Paris, 1879. *P. Koetschau,* Die Gliederung des ἀληθὴς λόγος des Celsus, in Jahrb. für protest. Theol. (1892), xviii. 604—632. *J. Fr. S. Muth,* Der Kampf des heidnischen Philosophen Celsus gegen das Christentum, Mainz, 1899. *F. A. Winter,* Über den Wert der direkten und indirekten Überlieferung von Origenes' Büchern «Contra Celsum» (Progr.), Burghausen, 1903, i.

7. WORKS AGAINST HERETICS. — His writings against heresy, and the records of his oral controversies with heretics, are known to us only through citations, thus, Julius Africanus mentions[1] a disputation on an unknown subject with a certain Agnomon (?) Bassus. Origen himself tells us of a discussion with the Valentinian Candidus (in the Catalogue it is called Dialogus adversus Candidum Valentinianum), probably at Athens about 240, on the origin of the Son from the Father, and the possibility of the devil's conversion[2]. Eusebius narrates the fact of his colloquy with Berillus, bishop of Bostra in Arabia, on the subject of Monarchianism, about the year 244[3].

The tradition in Epiphanius (Haer. 66, 21) that Origen refuted the Manichæans, and that he wrote against Menander, Basilides, Hermogenes and others, took its origin, very probably, in the fact that incidentally his works abound in anti-heretical polemic. Cf. *Theodoret.,* Haer. fab. comp. i. 2 4 19 25; ii. 2 7; iii. 1. For the authorship of the Philosophumena cf. § 54, 1 3, and on the *Dialogus de recta in Deum fide* cf. § 46, 2.

8. DOGMATIC WRITINGS. — The original text of all the doctrinal writings of Origen is lost. The most important of these works was the *De Principiis, περὶ ἀρχῶν.* It treated in four books of the fundamental doctrines or principles of Christian faith. Only some meagre fragments of the original have been preserved, mostly in the *Philocalia Origenis* (cc. 1 21). The whole work has reached us in a translation, or rather a free paraphrase, by Rufinus[4]; on the other hand the translation of St. Jerome, that aimed at literal correctness,

[1] *Jul. Afr.,* Ep. ad Orig. c. 1; *Orig.,* Ep. ad Afr. c. 2.

[2] *Orig.,* Ep. ad quosdam caros suos Alexandriam, in *Rufin.,* De adult. libr. Orig.; *Migne,* PG., xvii. 624 ff.; *Hier.,* Adv. Rufin., ii. 18—19.

[3] Hist. eccl., vi. 33, 3; *Hier.,* De viris ill. c. 60.

[4] *Migne,* PG., xi. 111—414.

has shared the fate of the original. Only a few fragments of it are extant[1]. On the foundations of the apostolic preaching, as roughly outlined by him at the beginning of his work, Origen undertakes to construct a consistent system of doctrine. The first book treats diffusely of God and the world of spirits; the second of the world and man, their renovation by means of the Incarnation of the Logos, and their end or scope, the third discusses human freedom and the final triumph of the good; the fourth is devoted to a theory of scriptural interpretation. This work was composed at Alexandria[2], about 230, and is the earliest attempt at a scientific exposition of Christian doctrine. By reason, however, of its departure from the lines of ecclesiastical tradition it aroused in equal measure both opposition and admiration. It was at Alexandria also[3] (before 231) that he wrote his ten books of «Miscellanies» (*στρωματεῖς;* cf. § 38, 3), on the aim and contents of which the few extant fragments[4] throw no clear light. From the philosophical doctrines of Plato and Aristotle, Numenius and Cornutus, he drew proofs of the truth of Christianity[5]. Various scriptural texts, e. g. of Daniel and Galatians, were explained by means of *scholia*[6] Before writing the *De principiis* he had composed at Alexandria two books on the resurrection, *περὶ ἀναστάσεως*[7]. The Catalogue of his works mentions two dialogues on the same subject dedicated to his friend Ambrose[8]. Some fragments of his work on the resurrection (De resurrectione)[9] of the body are preserved in the homonymous work of Methodius of Olympus; others in a treatise of St. Jerome[10]. Methodius defended against Origen the material identity of the risen body with that we now possess.

A separate edition of the *De principiis* was published by *E. R. Redepenning,* Leipzig, 1836. *C. Fr. Schnitzer* had already undertaken a reconstruction of it in German, Stuttgart, 1835. For an English translation of the fragments of the «De principiis» see Ante-Nicene Fathers (ed. Coxe, 1885, iv. 239 384). The *libellus de arbitrii libertate* mentioned by Origen (Comm. in Rom., vii. 16) is identified with *De principiis,* iii. 1. The little work «On the sin against the Holy Spirit» in Athanasius (Ep. 4, 9 ad Serap.) corresponds to *De principiis,* i. 3. *E. Riggenbach,* Der trinitarische Taufbefehl Mt. xxviii. 19 bei Origenes, Gütersloh, 1904.

9. ASCETIC WORKS AND HOMILIES. — Two of his works on practical asceticism have reached us, and their text is fairly well-preserved. Though not exempt from the influence of heterodox

[1] *Hier.,* Ep. 124. [2] *Eus.,* Hist. eccl., vi. 24, 3. [3] Ib.

[4] *Migne,* PG., xi. 99—108.

[5] *Hier.,* Ep. 70, 4; see the remarks of Eusebius concerning Origen's critical commentaries on the writings of pagan philosophers, in Hist. eccl., vi. 18, 3.

[6] *Hier.,* Comm. in Dan. ad iv. 5; ix. 24; xiii. 1; Comm. in Gal., prol.; ad v. 13

[7] *Orig.,* De princ., ii. 10, 1; *Eus.,* Hist. eccl., vi. 24, 2.

[8] Cf. Theoph. Alex., in *Hier.,* Ep. 92, 4.

[9] *Migne,* PG., xi. 91—100. [10] *Hier.,* Contra Io. Hieros, cc. 25—26.

ideas, they breathe a spirit of genuine piety. The work on Prayer *(περὶ εὐχῆς)*[1] was composed after the commentary on Genesis (c. 23), probably after 231, and was dedicated to Ambrose and Tatiana, the latter's wife or sister. It treats in the first part of prayer in general (cc. 3—17) and in the second (cc. 18—30) of the Lord's Prayer. The Exhortation to Martyrdom *(εἰς μαρτύριον προτρεπτικὸς λόγος)*[2], written some years later, appeals with powerful eloquence to Ambrose and to Protoctetus, a presbyter of Cæsarea, who had encountered[3] grave perils in the persecution of Maximinus Thrax (235—238). In his Catalogue of the works of Origen St. Jerome mentions, beside the exegetical homilies, other homilies, of which so far as is known, there is now no trace: *De pace* hom. i, *Exhortatoria ad Pioniam, De ieiunio, De monogamis et trigamis* hom. ii, *In Tharso* hom. ii.

The work on Prayer was first printed at Oxford in 1686. The Exhortation to Martyrdom was edited by *J. R. Wetstein,* Basle, 1674. A new edition of both has been brought out by *P Koetschau,* Leipzig, 1899 (Die griech. christl. Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrh., Origenes i—ii). For a German version of the same cf. *J. Kohlhofer,* Kempten, 1874 (Bibl. der Kirchenväter). *F. A. Winter,* Über den Wert der direkten und indirekten Überlieferung von Origenes' Büchern «contra Celsum» (Progr.), Burghausen, 1903, i.

10. THE LETTERS OF ORIGEN. — Origen must have kept up a very extensive correspondence. The Catalogue of his works makes mention of several collections of letters: *Epistolarum eius ad diversos libri* ix, *Aliarum epistolarum libri* ii, *Excerpta Origenis et diversarum ad eum epistolarum libri* ii *(epistolae synodorum super causa Origenis in libro secundo).* Of all these only two complete letters have reached us, one to Julius Africanus[4] and one to St. Gregory Thaumaturgus[5]. The first was written at Nicomedia (cc. 1 15) about 240. It defends with much erudition the genuineness and canonicity of the history of Susanna (and of the other deutero-canonical parts of the Book of Daniel) against objections of Julius Africanus in a letter addressed to Origen himself[6]. The second letter, probably written in the same year, contains fatherly advice to his former disciple Gregory: he should not allow his interest in the Holy Scriptures to flag, and should look on the study of the profane sciences only as a means towards the higher end of the knowledge of the Scriptures. Several other letters are known to us through citations in Eusebius, Rufinus, Jerome and others, e. g. one in reply to the reproach of too great attachment to Hellenic science[7], another

[1] *Migne,* PG., xi. 416—561. [2] Ib., xi. 564—637.
[3] *Eus.,* Hist. eccl., vi. 28. [4] *Migne,* PG., xi. 48—85.
[5] Ib., xi. 88—92. [6] Ib., xi. 41—48.
[7] *Eus.,* Hist. eccl., vi. 19, 12—14.

to the Emperor Philippus Arabs, and one to his consort, the Empress Severa[1], letters to Pope Fabian and to very many other bishops «in the matter of his orthodoxy»[2].

For the letter to St. Gregorius Thaumaturgus see *J. Dräseke,* in Jahrb. f. prot. Theologie (1881), vii. 102—126. It is published as an appendix to *P. Koetschau's* edition of the panegyric of St. Gregory on Origen (pp. 40—44, cf. xv—xvii), Freiburg i. Br., 1894.

11. WORKS OF UNCERTAIN AUTHORSHIP — In the preface to his *Liber interpretationis hebraicorum nominum,* St. Jerome says that it is a Latin version of a lexicon of proper names of the Old Testament made by Philo, and of a similar New Testament lexicon made by Origen. The author of the *Quaestiones et Responsa ad Orthodoxos,* attributed to St. Justin, makes Origen the author of Exposition of names or measures that recur in the Sacred Scriptures (qu. 86; cf. 82). The work in question may be some compilation by a later writer of etymologies of biblical proper names, proposed at different times by Origen. It seems certain that in their actual shape the Greek Onomastica, first edited by Martianay (1699), and recently by de Lagarde (1870 1887), are much more recent than the lexica compiled by Jerome. Victor of Capua[3] cites fragments *ex libro tertio Origenis περὶ φύσεων* and *ex Origenis libro primo De pascha.* There is no other mention of a work by Origen *περὶ φύσεων.* A *libellus Origenis De pascha* is mentioned in the *Liber Anatoli de ratione paschali* (c. 1)[4].

On the lexicon of the proper names in the New Testament see *O. Bardenhewer,* Der Name Maria, Freiburg, 1895 (Bibl. Studien, i. 1), pp. 23—26; *Redepenning,* Origenes, i. 458—461; *Zahn,* Gesch. des neutestamentl. Kanons, ii. 948—953.

12. PHILOSOPHICO-THEOLOGICAL IDEAS OF ORIGEN. — It was with the purest intention of contrasting the false Gnosis with true science, and of winning over to the Church the educated circles of Hellenism, that Origen undertook the combination of Hellenic philosophy with the faith of the Church. Nevertheless, his doctrinal system, that he imagined to be both Christian and ecclesiastical, bears the marks of Neoplatonism and Gnosticism. According to him it is a necessary consequence of the goodness of God that He should reveal or communicate Himself. It follows likewise, from His immutability, that this revelation should be from all eternity. Its organ is the Logos, other than the Father[5], not only in person but in substance (*κατ' οὐσίαν καὶ ὑποκείμενον:* De orat. l. c.). It is through

[1] Ib., vi. 36, 3.
[2] Ib., vi. 36, 4; for the letter to Pope Fabian see *Hier.,* Ep. 84, 10.
[3] Schol. vet. Patr., in *Pitra,* Spicil. Solesm., i. 268.
[4] *Migne,* PG., x. 210.
[5] De orat. c. 15: *ἕτερος τοῦ πατρός*: Contra Cels., v. 39: *δεύτερος θεός.*

the Logos that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father; He is inferior to the Logos, as the latter is inferior to the Father[1]. The next degree in the development of the divine unity into multiplicity is the world of spirits, to which belong the souls of men. They were all created from eternity and in equal perfection. They are not, however, essentially good; it is only by the exercise of their free will that they choose goodness. In the past they abused their freedom in manifold ways. In consequence, this sensible world was created as a place of purification for spirits expelled by God from their original home, enveloped in matter of divers kinds, and exiled in more or less gross material shapes, to which class our human bodies belong. In the end, however, all spirits must return to God. It is true that some must continue to undergo a process of purification, in the other world, but eventually all shall be saved and transfigured. Evil is then overcome; the world of the senses has fulfilled its purpose; all the non-spiritual elements sink or fade into nothing; the original unity of God and of all spiritual being is restored. Withal, this final restitution of original conditions *(ἀποκατάστασις, restitutio)* cannot be truly called the end of the world; properly speaking it is only the precarious term of an evolution that moves on endlessly between apostasy from God and return to Him. — Soon after his death the famous Origenistic controversies broke out, and found an echo even in the far-away West. In 543 the Synod of Constantinople condemned in fifteen «anathematisms» an equal number of propositions from Origen[2], and in 553 the Fifth General Council ranked him with «heretics» in its eleventh «anathematism»[3].

*G. Thomasius,* Origenes. Ein Beytrag zur Dogmengeschichte des 3. Jahrhunderts, Nürnberg, 1837. *G. Ramers,* Des Origenes Lehre von der Auferstehung des Fleisches (Inaug.-Diss.), Trier, 1851. *F. Harrer,* Die Trinitätslehre des Kirchenlehrers Origenes (Progr.), Regensburg, 1858. *J. B. Kraus,* Die Lehre des Origenes über die Auferstehung der Toten (Progr.), Regensburg, 1859. *Al. Vincenzi,* In S. Gregorii Nysseni et Origenis scripta et doctrinam nova recensio, cum appendice de actis synodi V oecum., Romae, 1864—1869, 5 voll. *Knittel,* Des Origenes Lehre von der Menschwerdung des Sohnes Gottes, in Theol. Quartalschr. (1872), liv. 97—138. *H. Schultz,* Die Christologie des Origenes im Zusammenhange seiner Weltanschauung, in Jahrb. für protest. Theol. (1875), i. 193—247 369—424. *J. Denis,* De la philosophie d'Origène. Mémoire couronné par l'Institut, Paris, 1884, vii. 730. *A. Harnack,* Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte, Freiburg 1888, i. 2, 559—604. *M. Lang,* Über die Leiblichkeit der Vernunftwesen bei Origenes (Inaug.-Diss.), Leipzig, 1892. *L. Atzberger,* Gesch der christl. Eschatologie innerhalb der vornicänischen Zeit, Freiburg, 1896 pp. 366—456. *G. Capitaine,* De Origenis ethica, Münster, 1898. *J. Turmel* L'eschatologie à la fin du 4e siècle. i: L'eschatologie origéniste, in Revue d'hist. et de littérature religieuses (1900), v. 99—127. *W. Fairweather*

[1] De princip., i. 3, 5. [2] *Mansi,* SS. Conc. Coll., ix. 395—400.
[3] Ib., ix. 384.

Origen and Greek Patristic Theology, London, 1901. *G. Anrich,* Clemens und Origenes als Begründer der Lehre vom Fegfeuer (Abhandlungen für *H. J. Holtzmann*), Tübingen, 1902. *F. Nau,* Le concile apostolique dans Origène, in Bull. crit. (1904), pp. 435—438.

13. AMBROSE. — This oft-mentioned friend and protector of Origen had been a high official of the imperial court (*Epiph.*, Haer. 64, 3). Through Origen he became a convert from Gnosticism (*Eus.*, Hist. eccl., vi. 18, 1). He left a correspondence with Origen (*Hier.*, De viris ill., c. 56). Short fragments of two letters of Ambrose are preserved in *Orig.*, De orat., c. 5; *Hier.*, Ep. 43, 1.

14. TRYPHO. — Besides some letters this disciple of Origen wrote many tractates (*multa opuscula*), among them one on the sacrifice of the red cow (Nm. xix) and another on the sacrifice of Abraham (Gen. xv. 9 ff). See *Jerome,* De viris ill., c. 57. So far as is known, no fragment of his writings has reached us.

15. AMMONIUS. — In his Church History Eusebius has confounded the Neoplatonist philosopher Ammonius Sakkas with a Christian of the same name. Among other books the latter wrote one on the accord between Moses and Jesus (περὶ τῆς Μωυσέως καὶ Ἰησοῦ συμφωνίας: *Eus.*, Hist. eccl., vi. 19, 10). He is probably identical with the «Ammonius of Alexandria» who compiled a synopsis of the gospels (διὰ τεσσάρων εὐαγγελίων) based on St. Matthew (*Eus.*, Ep. ad Carpianum; Hieronymus is inexact in De viris ill., c. 55). It is supposed that Ammonius was a contemporary of Origen. For the Latin gospel-harmony printed under his name see § 18, 3.

### § 40. Dionysius of Alexandria.

1. HIS LIFE. — He was born, apparently, before the end of the second century[1], of heathen parents. Through diligent reading and earnest investigation he was led to the Christian faith[2], and began to frequent the school of Origen[3]. From 231—232 he was the successor of Heraklas as head-master of the Alexandrine catechetical school[4] and retained the office, it would seem, even after he had succeeded Heraklas (247—248) as bishop of Alexandria[5]. The rest of his life was a series of conflicts and sufferings. In 250—251, he escaped by flight from the persecution of Decius[6]. During the persecution of Valerian in 257—258 he was banished to Kephro in Libya, and later to Colluthion in the Mareotis, «a still more savage and Libya-like place»[7] He does not seem to have returned to Alexandria before March 262. There he found awaiting him a condition of civil war, famine and pestilence[8]. He was too ill to take part in the Synod that met at Antioch in 264—265 in order to decide concerning Paul of Samosata[9]; he passed away during the deliberations of the Synod[10].

*Dittrich,* Dionysius der Große von Alexandrien, Freiburg 1867. Cf. *Th. Förster,* in Zeitschr. für die histor. Theol. (1871), xli. 42—76.

[1] *Eus.*, Hist. eccl., vii. 27, 2. [2] Ib., vii. 7, 3.
[3] Ib., vi. 29, 4. [4] Ib. [5] Ib., vi, 35. [6] Ib., vi. 40.
[7] Ib., vii. 11. [8] Ib., vii. 21—22. [9] Ib., vii. 27, 2.
[10] Ib., vii. 28, 3.

2. WORKS OF DIONYSIUS. — He was honored by Eusebius with the title of Great[1], and Athanasius called him a Doctor of the Catholic Church[2]. His greatness, however, was more in the man than in the teacher. He bore with energy and success the part that fell to him in the ecclesiastical difficulties of his time, and showed himself no less eloquent and firm in dealing with error, than he was mild and sagacious in his treatment of those who had gone astray. His writings are all occasional, dictated by the need of the hour. His diction is clear and lively, and while in doctrinal exposition he is not free from obscurity, he is always dominated by the noblest and most self-sacrificing spirit of zeal for the salvation of souls. Only a few fragments of his writings have reached us; most of them and those of chief importance, owe their preservation to their insertion into the Church History of Eusebius.

These fragments are found in *Migne,* PG., x. 1233—1344, 1575—1602, but in a very imperfect condition. A better edition is that of *S. de Magistris,* Rome, 1796, overlooked by *Migne.* For a list of the fragments missing in the edition of Migne see *Pitra,* Analecta Sacra iii. 596. Some Syriac and Armenian fragments current under the name of Dionysius were collected and translated into Latin by *P. Martin,* in *Pitra,* l. c., iv. 169—182, 413—422 (cf. xxiii ff.). See *Harnack,* Gesch. der altchristlichen Literatur, i. 409—427; *Th. Förster,* De doctrina et sententiis Dionysii M. ep. Alex. (Dissert. inaug.), Berlin, 1865; *Ch. L. Feltoe,* Διονυσίου λείψανα. The Letters and other remains of Dionysius of Alexandria, in Cambridge Patristic Texts (1904), xxxv. 283.

3. HIS PRINCIPAL WORKS. — In the Books on Nature, *οἱ περὶ φύσεως λόγοι*[3], as the fragments in Eusebius[4] show, he composed a solid and thorough polemic against an Epicureanism or materialism based on the atomic system of Democritus. The work was probably composed previous to 247—248. We know only the title of the Book on Temptations *(ὁ περὶ πειρασμῶν λόγος)*[5]. Through a later Catena there have come down some copious fragments, generally speaking authentic, of his commentary on Ecclesiastes[6], written supposedly before 247—248. They cover Ecclesiastes 1, 1 to 3, 11[7] The Catenae-fragments on the Book of Job are not genuine. Two Books on the Promises *(περὶ ἐπαγγελιῶν δύο συγγράμματα)*, written probably in 253—257, are directed against a «Refutation of the Allegorists» *(ἔλεγχος ἀλληγοριστῶν)*, composed by a certain Nepos, bishop in the district of Arsinoe[8]. In opposition to Origen the latter undertook to defend the historical interpretation of the Scriptures, and maintained that in the Apocalypse there was promised after the Re-

[1] *Eus.,* Hist. eccl., vii., praef. [2] Ep. de sent. Dion., c. 6.
[3] *Eus.,* Hist. eccl., vii. 26, 2.
[4] Praep. Evang., xiv. 23—27; *Migne,* PG., x. 1249—1268.
[5] *Eus.,* Hist. eccl., vii. 26, 2. [6] Ib., vii. 26, 3.
[7] *Migne,* PG., x. 1577—1588. [8] *Eus.*, Hist. eccl., vii. 24, 1.

surrection a millennial reign of the just on this earth. In the first book of his work Dionysius argued against these Chiliastic dreams, while in the second he commented on the authority of the Apocalypse. According to him it was composed by a «holy and divinely inspired man», though not by the Evangelist John[1] His own orthodoxy was the subject of a controversy that broke out apropos of some letters he wrote, after 257, in reference to Sabellianism[2]. In order to emphasize very plainly the personal distinction between the Father and the Son, Dionysius had made use of expressions and similes that implied a distinction in substance and reduced the Son to the rank of a creature[3] For this a complaint was laid against him before Pope Dionysius (259—268), and he was invited by the latter to explain his words. This he did in a reply[4] to the Pope, and more fully in the four books of his «Refutation and Defence» (*ἔλεγχος καὶ ἀπολογία*)[5]. They contain an exposition of his thoroughly orthodox teaching concerning the Trinity, and seem to have quite satisfied the Pope. The extant fragments have come down to us chiefly through citations in Athanasius and Basil the Great.

The first and most complete collection of the fragments of the work on Nature is in *Routh*, Reliquiae sacrae, iv. 393—437. The fragments preserved by Eusebius were translated into German and illustrated at length by *G. Roch*, Die Schrift des alexandr. Bischofs Dionysius d. Gr. «Über die Natur» (Inaug. Diss.), Leipzig, 1882. There is an English translation of the literary remains of Dionysius by *Salmond*, in Ante-Nicene Fathers (ed. Coxe, 1896), vi. 81—120. For the spurious Catenae-fragments on Job see *Routh*, l. c., iv. 439—454, and ib., iii. 390—400 (*Migne*, PL., v. 117—128) for the remnants of the «Refutation and Defence», taken from Athanasius, Basil the Great, and other authors. We ought probably to add a fragment from «the first book of the work against Sabellius (*πρὸς Σαβέλλιον*), mentioned by *Eusebius* (Praep. evang., vii. 19). For his teaching concerning the Trinity see *H. Hagemann*, Die römische Kirche in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten, Freiburg, 1864, pp. 411—432, and *Dittrich*, l. c., pp. 91—115.

4. HIS LETTERS. — Apropos of the schism of Novatian and the question of the treatment of the Lapsi, Dionysius wrote, after 251, a series of letters, in which he urged Novatian and his followers to submit to the legitimate Pope Cornelius (251—253) and advocated the mildest possible treatment of those who had fallen during the persecutions. His Letter to the anti-pope Novatian is a noble and memorable document[6]. He wrote also a letter to Fabius, bishop of Antioch, some fragments of which are preserved in Eusebius[7]. After 256 he

[1] Fragments of the second book in *Eus.*, Hist. eccl., vii. 24—25; *Migne*, PG., x. 1237—1250.

[2] *Eus.*, Hist. eccl., vii. 6, 26, 1. [3] *Athan.*, Ep. de sent. Dion., c. 4.

[4] Ib., c. 18. [5] Ib., c. 13; cf. *Eus.*, Hist. eccl., vii. 26, 1.

[6] *Eus.*, Hist. eccl., vi. 45.

[7] Ib., vi. 41—42 44; for other letters cf. ib., vi. 46.

acted as peacemaker in the conflict concerning the validity of heretical baptism, though he does not seem to have thoroughly grasped the full meaning of the controversy. Only Eusebian excerpts of the latter correspondence have reached us[1] Apropos of the teachings of Paul of Samosata he wrote in 264—265 a condemnatory letter to the Church of Antioch[2]. The letter to Paul, found in the collections of the councils[3], is an Apollinarist or Monophysite forgery. It was an ancient custom of the bishops of Alexandria to send an annual letter to the churches of their dioceses. Such communications were known as Festal Letters *(ἐπιστολαὶ ἑορταστικαί)* and were usually issued after Epiphany They announced the date of Easter and the beginning of the preparatory fast; they also contained instructions concerning the Easter festival or other matters. From a few of these Festal Letters of Dionysius, Eusebius has saved some historical data[4] In a Festal Letter to Domitius and Didymus, written in the reign of Decius, before the Easter of 251[5], Dionysius promulgates an eight-year paschal cycle, and orders that the feast shall always be celebrated after the Spring Equinox[6]. He wrote in his own defence to the Egyptian bishop Germanus who had reproached him for flying from the persecution[7]. In a letter to Hermammon and the brethren in Egypt, Dionysius «related much concerning the iniquity of Decius and his successors and then made mention of the peace under Gallienus»[8]. A letter to Basilides, bishop of the churches of the Pentapolis[9], has been preserved in its entirety, by reason of its incorporation among the canonical documents of the Greek Church. It treats principally of the precise time of the Resurrection of Our Lord, and therefore of the time when the fast of preparation should cease and the paschal festivities begin[10]. Stephen Gobarus mentions a letter of Dionysius to Theotecnus, bishop of Cæsarea in Palestine, written after the death of Origen, and dealing favorably with his memory[11].

The *Epistola canonica ad Basilidem* is in *Routh,* l. c., iii. 219—250, also in *Pitra,* Iuris eccles. Graecorum historia et monumenta, Romae, 1864, i. 541—545; cf. 548 f. For two letters in a *Codex Vaticanus* bearing the name of Dionysius but belonging to Isidore Pelusiota, see *G. Mercati,* Note di letteratura biblica e cristiana antica (Studi e Testi, v. 2—86), Rome, 1901. *G. Holzhey,* in Theol.-praktische Monatsschrift (1901), xi. 513—525, concludes from the relations between the Didascalia Apostolorum (§ 46) and the works of Dionysius that towards the end of his literary career he recast the original nucleus of the *Didascalia;* probably it was done by one of his disciples, shortly after his death. At a later date this

[1] *Eus.,* Hist. eccl., vii. 4—9. [2] Ib., vii. 27, 2.
[3] *Mansi,* i. 1039—1088. [4] *Eus.,* Hist. eccl., vii. 20—22.
[5] Ib., vii. 11, 20—25. [6] Ib., vii. 20. [7] Ib., vi. 40; vii. 11.
[8] Ib., vii. 22, 12; fragments ib., vii. 1, 10, 23. [9] Ib., vii. 26, 3.
[10] *Migne,* PG., x. 1271—1290. [11] *Phot.,* Bibl. God. 232.

revised *Didascalia* was enlarged to its present shape. In the Revue d'Histoire ecclésiastique (1901), ii. 808—809, *F. X. Funk,* expresses grave doubts concerning this theory of Holzhey.

5. ANATOLIUS. — This writer appears about 262 as a respectable and influential citizen of Alexandria. We meet him later as coadjutor of Theotecnus, bishop of Cæsarea in Palestine. From 269 he was bishop of Laodicea in Syria. He was well-skilled in philosophy, the natural sciences and mathematics, and he wrote some works: on Easter (περὶ τοῦ πάσχα), an introduction to arithmetic (ἀριθμητικαὶ εἰσαγωγαί) in ten books, and «specimens of his erudition and ability in theology» (*Eus.,* Hist. eccl., vii. 32, 6; *Hier.,* De viris ill., c. 73). His theological writings are lost. Of very doubtful authenticity are certain mathematical fragments under the name of Anatolius (*Fabricius-Harles,* Bibl. Gr., iii. 461 462—464; *Migne,* PG., x. 231—236). Of his work on Easter, Eusebius has preserved a long fragment (Hist. eccl., vii. 32, 14—19). As to the *Liber Anatoli de ratione paschali* printed with a commentary (*Migne,* PG., x. 209—232), we may believe with *Zahn* (Forschungen [1884], iii. 177—196) that it is not a translation of the work of the bishop of Laodicea, although in the second chapter, almost the entire Eusebian paschal-fragment is cited. *Br. Krusch* maintains (Studien zur christlich-mittelalterlichen Chronologie, Leipzig, 1880, pp. 311—316) that it is a sixth-century forgery, made in England during the Brito-Roman controversy on the manner of celebrating Easter. We owe to *Krusch* a new edition of the *Liber Anatoli* (ib., pp. 316—327). Cf. *A. Anscombe* and *C. H. Turner,* in The English Historical Review (1895), x. 515—535 699—710: *T Hicklin,* The date and origin of the Pseudo-Anatolius «de ratione paschali», in Journal of Philology (1901), xxviii. 137—151. He finds in the work traces of an original composition about 300, and of a version made about 410. There is an English translation by *Salmond,* of the fragments of Anatolius, in Ante-Nicene Fathers (ed. Coxe, 1896), vi. 146—153.

### § 41. The later headmasters of the catechetical school of Alexandria.

1. THEOGNOSTUS. — In an anonymous excerpt from Philippus Sidetes (§ 20, 1), it is said that Pierius was the successor of Dionysius in the catechetical school of Alexandria, and that Theognostus succeeded Pierius. In all probability, however, Theognostus preceded Pierius[1]; this writer is not mentioned by either Eusebius or Jerome. He left seven books of «Hypotyposes» (ὑποτυπώσεις, cf. § 38, 4). According to the description of them by Photius[2], they contained a dogmatic system disposed in a strictly orderly manner, but also strongly influenced by Origenistic theories. The first book treated of God the Father, the second of the Son, the third of the Holy Spirit, the fourth of angels and demons, the fifth and sixth of the Incarnation of the Son, the seventh of the divine creation of the world (*περὶ θεοῦ δημιουργίας*). Certain citations from Theognostus in works of Athanasius and Gregory of Nyssa were very probably taken from the «Hypotyposes».

[1] *Athan.,* Ep. 4 ad Serap. c. 9; Ep. de decr. Nic. Syn., c. 25.
[2] Bibl. Cod. 106.

For the «testimonia» concerning Theognostus and the editions of the fragments of the Hypotyposes see *Migne,* PG., x. 235—242, and *Routh,* Reliquiae sacrae (2), iii. 405—422. For an English translation of the fragments of Theognostus see *Salmond,* in Ante-Nicene Fathers (ed. Coxe, 1890), vi. 155—156. — *A. Harnack,* Die Hypotyposen des Theognost (Texte und Untersuchungen, new series, ix. 3), Leipzig, 1903. *Fr. Diekamp,* Ein neues Fragment aus den Hypotyposen des Alexandriners Theognostus, in Theol. Quartalschr. (1902), lxxxiv. 48—494.

2. PIERIUS. — He was a priest of Alexandria, in the time of Theonas, bishop of that city (281—300), and was distinguished as an ascetic, a writer and a preacher[1]. His ability as a Christian orator caused him to be known as «the younger Origen»[2] Philippus Sidetes (see § 41, 1) and Photius[3] assert that he was head-master of the catechetical school at Alexandria. They also say (Philip in an extract first edited by De Boor) that he was a martyr. They probably do not mean that he actually died a martyr's death, but that he publicly confessed Christ. He certainly survived the persecution of Diocletian, for we meet him at Rome after the persecution of Diocletian[4]. Photius[5] speaks of a work *(βιβλίον)* of Pierius in twelve treatises *(λόγοι)* containing Origenistic errors on the subordination of the Holy Spirit and the preexistence of souls. Eusebius and Jerome may be interpreted as meaning that it was a book of sermons[6]. According to Photius, one fragment of the work was entitled «on the gospel of St. Luke» *(εἰς τὸ κατὰ Λουκᾶν)*, another «on Easter and Osee» *(εἰς τὸ πάσχα καὶ τὸν Ὡσηέ)*. St. Jerome says[7] that the latter work was a long Easter sermon on the beginning of the prophecy of Osee. The titles of three other works are mentioned in the excerpts found in Philippus Sidetes; the first of a series of paschal sermons *(ὁ πρῶτος λόγος τῶν εἰς τὸ πάσχα)* on the ideas of St. Paul concerning virginity and matrimony[8]; on the Mother of God *(περὶ τῆς θεοτόκου)*; on the life of St. Pamphilus *(εἰς τὸν βίον τοῦ ἁγίου Παμφίλου)*, the friend of Eusebius and disciple of St. Pierius[9].

For the fragments of Pierius see *Routh,* l. c., iii. 423—435, and *Migne,* PG., x. 241—246. Some new fragments were published by *C. de Boor,* in Texte und Untersuchungen (1888), v. 2, 165—184. For an English translation of the fragments of Pierius see *Salmond,* in Ante-Nicene Fathers (ed. Coxe, 1896), vi. 157. — Until recently the above-mentioned bishop, Theonas of Alexandria, was usually identified with the homonymous bishop under whose name had long been current a Latin letter *ad Lucianum cubiculariorum praepositum,* first published by d'Achery in 1675, whence it passed unchallenged into the *Bibliothecae patrum* (*Routh,* l. c., iii. 437—449; *Migne,* PG., x. 1567—1574). This letter pretends to instruct Lucian, chief of the imperial chamberlains, and the other Christian officers at court as

[1] *Eus.,* Hist. eccl., vii. 32, 26 f. 30. [2] *Hier.,* De viris ill., c. 76.
[3] Bibl. Cod. 118 119. [4] *Hier.,* De viris ill., c. 76.
[5] Bibl. Cod. 119. [6] *Eus.,* l. c.; *Hier.,* l. c.
[7] L. c. and Comm. in Hos., praef. [8] *Hier.,* Ep. 49, 3.
[9] *Phot.,* Bibl. Cod. 118 119.

to the manner in which they shall act in order to preserve and strengthen the favorable sentiments of the still pagan emperor (Diocletian?) towards Christians. After the researches of *P. Batiffol,* in Bulletin Critique (1886), vii. 155—160, and *Harnack,* Theol. Literaturzeitung (1886), xi. 319—326, there can be no doubt that the letter is a forgery of late date, perhaps from the pen of the Oratorian Jérôme Vignier († 1661): cf. § 3, 2. — *A. Harnack,* Der gefälschte Brief des Bischofs Theonas an den Oberkammerherrn Lucian, in Texte und Untersuchungen, new series, Leipzig, 1903, ix. 3. There is an English translation of the Letter of Theonas by *Salmond,* in Ante-Nicene Fathers (ed. Coxe, 1896), vi. 158—161.

3. PETER OF ALEXANDRIA. — According to the afore-mentioned «excerpts» from Philippus Sidetes, Theognostus was followed by Serapion in the headship of the Alexandrine catechetical school, and Serapion by Peter. It is no longer possible to identify Serapion. Peter, on the other hand, was bishop of Alexandria and «a splendid model of a bishop» from the year 300 until his death as a martyr in 311[1]. We still possess in a Latin version a brief letter addressed by Peter to his people shortly after the outbreak of the persecution of Diocletian (*Febr.* 303), in order to warn them against Meletius, the intruded bishop of Lycopolis[2]. There is extant also an epitome of a treatise on penance *(περὶ μετανοίας)*, of the year 306, both in Greek and in a Syriac version. Its fourteen canons regulate the conditions on which those who had fallen in the persecution might return to ecclesiastical communion. It is usually called Epistola canonica[3]. In several of the Greek manuscripts a fifteenth canon is added from a work of St. Peter on Easter *(εἰς τὸ πάσχα, περὶ τοῦ πάσχα)*, known to us also from other sources. In the Acts of the Council of Ephesus (431) there appear three citations from a work of Peter on the Divinity *(περὶ θεότητος)*[4] Two other citations, extant in Syriac only, are apparently spurious. A fragment of his work on the Coming of the Savior *(περὶ τῆς σωτῆρος ἡμῶν ἐπιδημίας)* is quoted by Leontius of Byzantium[5] In his work against the Monophysites this latter writer quotes two fragments from the first book of a work of Peter written against the pre-existence and the antecedent sinfulness of the soul *(περὶ τοῦ μηδὲ προϋπάρχειν τὴν ψυχὴν μηδὲ ἁμαρτήσασαν τοῦτο εἰς σῶμα βληθῆναι)*. They are especially interesting, since they show that Peter opposed with energy, not only in preaching but in writing, the errors of Origen. This is also proved by seven Syriac fragments of a work *De resurrectione,* which rigorously defends the material identity of the post-resurrection body with that we now possess.

*Routh,* l. c., iv. 19—82, and *Migne,* PG., xviii. 449—522. The best edition (Greek and Syriac) of the *Epistola canonica* is that of *P. de Lagarde,* Reliquiae iuris eccles. antiquissimae, Leipzig, 1856, Greek text

[1] *Eus.,* Hist. eccl., ix. 6, 2, cf. viii. 13, 7; vii. 32, 31.
[2] *Migne,* PG., xviii. 509—510. [3] Ib., xviii. 467—508.
[4] Ib., xviii. 509—512. [5] Contra Nestor. et Eutych., l. 1.

pp. 63—73, Syriac text pp. 99—117. See also Greek text, pp. xlvi—liv. In *Pitra,* Analecta sacra, iv. 187—195 425—430, *P Martin* collected and translated other fragments (Syriac and Armenian). For an English translation of the Acts of Peter, the Canonical Epistle and some fragments see *Hawkins*, in Ante-Nicene Fathers (ed. Coxe, 1896), vi. 261—285. — *W E. Crum,* Texts attributed to Peter of Alexandria, in Journal of Theological Studies (1903), iv. 387—397. See *Harnack,* Gesch. der altchristl. Literatur, i. 443—449. In his Fragment einer Schrift des Märtyrerbischofs Petrus von Alexandrien, Leipzig, 1901 (Texte und Untersuchungen, new series, v. 4, 2) *Karl Schmidt* has made known a Coptic text (with German translation) of a fragment of a rigid exhortation to the observance of the Sunday rest. He attributes it to Peter, who is clearly indicated in the text. The fragment itself is certainly of a later date; it is perhaps the source of the famous Letter of Christ that was alleged to have fallen from heaven (Analecta Bollandiana (1901), xx. 101—103).

4. Phileas of Thmuis. — From his prison in Alexandria, where he died a martyr about 307, Phileas, bishop of Thmuis in Lower Egypt, addressed a letter to his church. Eusebius extracted from it a long passage concerning the conflicts and triumphs of the martyrs at Alexandria (Hist. eccl., viii. 10; cf. *Hier.,* De viris ill., c. 78). We possess also, in a Latin version, a letter written in common by the imprisoned bishops Hesychius, Pachomius, Theodorus and Phileas, addressed to Meletius, bishop of Lycopolis, who had been conferring orders outside his own diocese, in contravention of the ecclesiastical canons (*Routh,* l. c., iv. 83—111; *Migne,* PG., x. 1559—1568). There is an English translation of the literary remains of Phileas by *Salmond,* in Ante-Nicene Fathers (ed. Coxe, 1896), vi. 161—164.

5. Hesychius. — An Egyptian Hesychius, who may have lived towards the end of the third century, undertook a critical revision of the Septuagint (*Hier.,* Praef. in Paral.; Comm. in Is. ad 58, 11), also a recension of the New Testament or at least of the Gospels (*Hier.,* Praef. in Evang.). We cannot say that he is identical with the Hesychius just mentioned (cf. *Eus.,* Hist. eccl., viii. 13, 7, and the Introductions to the New Testament).

6. Hierakas. — This writer lived about 300 at Leontopolis in the Nile Delta, where he gathered about himself a large community of ascetics. He wrote commentaries on the Scriptures in Greek and Egyptian (Coptic), a work on the Hexaemeron, many new Psalms (ψαλμοὺς πολλοὺς νεωτερικούς), and perhaps some special works on marriage and on the Holy Spirit. He carried to the last extreme the allegorism and spiritualism of Origen, rejected marriage, denied the resurrection of the body, claimed that the Holy Ghost had manifested Himself in Melchisedech, and excluded from the kingdom of heaven those children who died before attaining the use of reason, even if they had been baptized. Our only source of information concerning Hierakas is the account in Epiphanius (Haer. 67; cf. Haer. 55, 5; 69, 7).

### § 42. The so-called Apostolic Church-Ordinance.

This is the title given by its first editor, J. W Bickell (1843), to a little work which announces itself as emanating from the twelve Apostles. The complete Greek text has reached us in only one manuscript, probably of the twelfth century. The title it offers is: *αἱ διαταγαὶ αἱ διὰ Κλήμεντος καὶ κανόνες ἐκκλησιαστικοὶ τῶν ἁγίων ἀποστόλων.* The first words, *αἱ διαταγαὶ αἱ διὰ Κλήμεντος καὶ*, are

surely a later addition, borrowed from the so-called Apostolic Constitutions (§ 75, 1). Apart from the introduction (cc. 1—3) and the conclusion (c. 30) the work falls into two parts, the first of which (cc. 4—14) presents moral rules, while the second (cc. 15—29) contains legal ordinances. The moral rules are thrown into the form of a description of the Way of Life and the Way of Death, or rather of the Way of Life. The legal ordinances deal with the qualities of a bishop (c. 16), the presbyters (cc. 17 18), the lector (c. 19), the deacons (cc. 20 22), the widow-deaconesses (c. 21), also the proper conduct of the laity (c. 23), and the question of the participation of women in the liturgical service (cc. 24—29). In both parts each phrase or chapter is placed in the mouth of an Apostle (e. g. *Ἰωάννης εἶπεν, Ματθαῖος εἶπεν*). The entire first part or description of the Way of Life is no more than a slightly modified revision of the Two Ways (§ 6) in the Didache (cc. 1, 1 to 4 8). Harnack attempted to identify in the second part fragments of two earlier canonical documents. But Funk has shown that this is impossible. The work was probably composed towards the end of the third century, and with equal probability in Egypt. In that land it seems to have found a more general acceptance and diffusion, and to have attained the dignity of a local Canon Law. With it begins the *Corpus iuris canonici* of the Coptic, Ethiopic and Arabic churches of Egypt. An ancient Syriac version and a fragment of an ancient Latin version have reached us. Jerome mentions[1] a pseudo-Petrine work known as *Liber iudicii* (i. e. Petri), and Rufinus knew[2] a *Liber ecclesiasticus,* entitled *Duae viae vel Iudicium secundum Petrum* (al. *Iudicium Petri*). In both places there is probably question of the Apostolic Church-Ordinance. The title *Duae viae* was easily suggested by the contents of the first part; that of *Iudicium Petri* came probably from the fact that Peter is introduced as speaker oftener than the other apostles and has the last word (c. 30).

For editions of the Greek text of the Apostolic Church-Ordinance see *J. W. Bickell,* Geschichte des Kirchenrechts, Giessen, 1843, i. 107—132; *A. P. de Lagarde,* Reliquiae iuris ecclesiastici antiquissimae graece, Leipzig, 1856, pp. 74—79; *P. tra,* Iuris ecclesiastici Graecorum historia et monumenta, Romae, 1864, i. 75—88; *A. Hilgenfeld,* Novum Testamentum extra canonem rec., fasc. iv, Leipzig, 1866, pp. 93—106; 2. ed. 1884, pp. 110 to 121. It is also reprinted or re-edited in the editions of the Didache (§ 6, 4) by *Philotheos Bryennios,* Constantinople, 1883; *Harnack,* Leipzig, 1884 and 1893; *Ph. Schaff,* New York, 1885 1886 1889 (the latter gives only cc. 1—13 of the Apostolic Church-Ordinance); *F. X. Funk,* Tübingen, 1887; *J. Rendel Harris,* Baltimore and London, 1887. — An Ethiopic text, with a Latin version, had already been edited by *J. Ludolfus,* Ad suam Historiam Aethiopicam antehac editam Commentarius, Frankfurt, 1691, 314—323. In his Apostolic Constitutions, London, 1848, pp. 1—30, *H. Tattam* published a North-Egyptian (Memphitic, Bohairic) text, with an

[1] De viris ill., c. 1. [2] Comm. in Symb. Apost., c. 38.

English version. On the basis of the edition of Tattam, *P. Bötticher (P. de Lagarde)* undertook to re-translate this text into Greek, in *Chr. C. J. Bunsen,* Analecta Ante-Nicaena, London, 1854, ii, 451—460. A South-Egyptian (Theban, Sahidic) text was published by *P. de Lagarde,* Aegyptiaca, Göttingen, 1883, pp. 239—248 (without a translation), and by *U. Bouriant,* in Recueil de travaux relatifs à la philol. et à l'archéol. égypt. et assyr., Paris, 1883—1884, v. 202—206 (also without a translation). It has been shown that the North-Egyptian text is a version of the South-Egyptian; it is still doubtful whether it be also the parent of the Ethiopic text. An Arabian text, preserved in manuscript, is not yet published. In his Stromation Archaiologikon, Rome, 1900, pp. 15—31, *A. Baumstark* published a Syriac text; similarly *J. P. Arendzen,* An Entire Syriac Text of the Apostolic Church-Order, in Journal of Theological Studies (1901), iii. 59—80. For the conclusion of a very ancient Latin text see *E. Hauler,* Didascaliae apostolorum fragmenta Veronensia Latina, Leipzig, 1900, i. 91—101. *A. Krawutzky,* Über das altkirchliche Unterrichtsbuch «Die zwei Wege oder die Entscheidung des Petrus», in Theol. Quartalschr. (1892), lxiv. 359—445. *A. Harnack,* Die Quellen der sog. apostolischen Kirchenordnung, Leipzig, 1886 (Texte und Untersuchungen ii. 5). *Funk,* Kirchengeschichtl. Abhandlungen und Untersuchungen (1899), ii. 236—251. *Th. Schermann,* Eine neue Handschrift der apostolischen Kirchenordnung, in Oriens Christianus (1902), pp. 398—408.

THE LETTER OF PSENOSIRIS. — This is perhaps the place to insert, among the writings of the Alexandrines, the letter that the priest Psenosiris wrote to Apollo, his brother in the Lord, notifying him that a female fellow-citizen (πολιτικήν), exiled by the city-prefect to the Oasis, had been placed by him (Psenosiris) in the hands of good and faithful fossores or grave-diggers. This letter was discovered among other papyri that came from Kysis (Dùsch-el-Kala) in the Great Oasis and are now in the British Museum. They bear dates varying from 242 to 307 It is conjectured that the woman was a Christian exiled for her faith to the Great Oasis, in which case it must be question either of the persecution of Valerian or that of Diocletian. Most of those who have written about this document decide for the latter date.

The Letter of Psenosiris was edited by *A. Deissmann,* Ein Original-Dokument aus der diokletianischen Christenverfolgung, Papyrus 713 des British Museum, Tübingen and Leipzig, 1902; *Id.,* The Epistle of Psenosiris, an Original Document from the Diocletian Persecution, London, 1902; *P. Franchi de' Cavalieri,* Una lettera del tempo della persecuzione diocleziana, in Nuovo Bullet. di archeologia cristiana (1902), viii. 15—25; *A. Mercati,* in the Italian translation of the present work, Rome, 1903, iii. IX.

## B. SYRO-PALESTINIANS.

### § 43. Julius Africanus.

1. HIS LIFE. — Sextus Julius Africanus, a Lybian[1], seems to have been an officer in the expedition of Septimius Severus against the Osrhoënes (195). He enjoyed intimate relations both with the royal house of Edessa and the imperial family. About 211—215 he visited Alexandria and attended the lectures of Heraclas (§ 39, 1)[2]. During the reign of Alexander Severus (222—235) he held an office

[1] *Suidas,* Lex. s. v. Africanus. [2] *Eus.,* Hist. eccl., vi. 31, 2.

of distinction at Emmaus-Nicopolis in the plain of Philistia[1]. Later Syriac writers have been misled into making him a bishop of Emmaus; he does not seem to have been even a presbyter. He died after 240 (cf. § 39, 10).

*H. Gelzer,* Sextus Julius Africanus und die byzantinische Chronographie, Leipzig, 1880—1898, i. 1—11.

2. THE CHRONOGRAPHIA. THE *Κεστοί.* — His most important work was a universal chronicle in five books completed in 221 and entitled *Chronographia (χρονογραφίαι)*[2]. Though none of its five books is intact, more or less lengthy fragments of all have reached us. The purpose of Africanus was to correlate and harmonize Jewish and Christian history with the history of the Gentile world. He found in the biblical dates the sure criterion by which to judge the historicity of the profane dates offered in the current manuals of chronology. The entire history of the world, according to Africanus, covers a period of six thousand years, the first three thousand are closed by the death of Phaleg, «because in his days the earth was divided» (Gen. x. 25). The next three thousand years will close with the end of the world; half-way in the last millennium, i. e. in the year 5500, the Son of God became man. This first of Christian world-chronicles has never lacked zealous admirers, and industrious use has constantly been made of it. It rendered substantial service to the Father of Church History; in modified and often even in corrupted forms it has dominated all Byzantine historiography — He dedicated to Alexander Severus[3] an extensive encyclopædia of the natural sciences, medicine, magic, agriculture, naval and military warfare, and gave it the curious title of «Embroidered Girdles» *(κεστοί).* Photius says[4] that it included fourteen books, but Suidas[5] gives the number of books as twenty-four. Of this encyclopædia many fragments, some of them not unimportant, have reached us, especially through later and more special works, e. g. the collection of Greek tacticians, the compilation of excerpts from writers on agriculture known as *Geoponica,* and the manual of veterinary science known as *Hippiatrica.* While the vulgar superstition they exhibit, and the obscenities that swarm in the fragment on Aphrodisiac secrets, are well-calculated to lessen our respect for Africanus, they do not justify us in suspecting the authenticity of his works, or attempting to divide the authorship of the *κεστοί* and the *Chronographia.*

The existing collections of the fragments of the Chronographia (*Migne,* PG., x. 63—94; *Routh,* Reliquiae Sacrae [2] ii. 238—309) are unsatisfactory. A new collection is expected from *H. Gelzer* (l. c.). The first

[1] Sync. Chronogr. ed. *Dindorf,* i. 676. [2] *Eus.,* Hist. eccl., vi. 31, 2.
[3] *Eus.,* Hist. eccl., vi. 31, 1; cf. *Geoponica,* l. 1, praef.: *κεστοὶ ἢ παράδοξα.*
[4] Bibl. Cod. 34. [5] Lex., l. c.

part of this work of Gelzer deals with the Chronography of Africanus (supplementary matter in Jahrb. f. prot. Theologie [1881], vii. 376—378); the second part (1885—1898) treats of his Greek and Latin, Syriac and Armenian successors. There is no satisfactory collection of the fragments of the «Embroidered Girdles». They are enumerated by *Gelzer,* l. c., i. 12—17, and *Preuschen,* in *Harnack,* Gesch. der altchristl. Lit., i. 508—511. There is an English translation of the literary remains of Africanus by *Salmond,* in Ante-Nicene Fathers (ed. Coxe, 1886), vi. 146—153.

3. LETTERS. DOUBTFUL AND SPURIOUS WORKS. — An entire letter of Africanus to Origen has been preserved, in which he opposes the genuineness and canonicity of the history of Susanna in the Book of Daniel (§ 39, 10), also fragments of another to a certain Aristides[1] in which, on the basis of ancient traditions, he undertakes to harmonize the apparent antilogies in the genealogies of Our Lord as given in St. Matthew and St. Luke. He makes Jacob (Mt. i. 16) the natural father, and Heli (Lk. iii. 23) the legal father of Joseph. Both letters are mentioned by Eusebius[2], and are eloquent monuments of an acute and searching criticism far beyond the ordinary contemporary level. It is very doubtful that he wrote commentaries on the Gospels or on the New Testament, as the Syriac writers (Dionysius Bar Salibi and Ebedjesu) maintain. It is owing to an interchange of names (Africanus for Aphroditiamus) that a ridiculous story of miraculous occurrences in Persia at the time of the birth of Christ has been attributed to our chronographer[3]. Nor can he be the author of the *Passio S. Symphorosae et septem filiorum eius*[4].

Both letters of Africanus are in *Routh,* l. c., ii. 225—237. See *Fr Spitta,* Der Brief des Julius Africanus an Aristides, kritisch untersucht und hergestellt, Halle, 1877. For the writings falsely attributed to Africanus see in particular *Gelzer,* l. c., i. 18 f. (Jahrb. f. prot. Theol. vii. 376 f.); *Preuschen,* l. c., p. 513. There is an English translation of the letter to Origen in Ante-Nicene Fathers, (ed. Coxe, 1896), vi. 385 f.

4. ALEXANDER OF JERUSALEM. — Alexander, the founder of the theological library of Jerusalem (§ 37), was for a brief period bishop in Cappadocia (*Eus.,* Hist. eccl. vi. 11, 1—2). About 212 he became coadjutor to the aged bishop Narcissus of Jerusalem (ib. vi. 8, 7), and succeeded him shortly after in that office which he held until his glorious death as a martyr in 250 (ib. vi. 39, 2—3). Eusebius mentions many of his letters; one was written from his prison in Cappadocia to the Christians of Antioch, congratulating them on the choice of their new bishop, Asclepiades (ib. vi. 11, 5—6). Another was written at Jerusalem, in the life-time of Narcissus, as an exhortation to the Christians of Antinonia in Egypt (ib. vi. 11, 3). A third letter was written to Origen (ib. vi. 14, 8—9). Both Alexander and bishop Theoctistus of Cæsarea wrote to bishop Demetrius of Alexandria in defence of lay-preaching (ib. vi. 19, 17—18). St. Jerome (De viris ill., c. 62) seems to have known another letter of Alexander to Demetrius concerning Origen's ordination to the priesthood. For the «testimonia» concerning Alexander see *Migne,* PG., x. 203—206 and *Routh,* l. c., ii.

[1] *Migne,* PG., x. 51—64.
[2] Hist. eccl., vi. 31, 1 3.
[3] *Migne,* PG., x. 97—108.
[4] Ib., x. 93—98.

159—179; *Harnack*, l. c., i. 505—507: cf. ii. 1, 221—223. For an English translation of the fragments of Alexander see *Salmond*, in Ante-Nicene Fathers (ed. Coxe, 1896), vi. 153—154.

5. BERYLLUS OF BOSTRA. — About 244 Origen converted this bishop from Monarchianism to the teachings of the Church (§ 39, 7). Beryllus left letters and treatises (*Eus.*, Hist. eccl. vi. 20, 2), also letters to Origen (*Hier.*, De viris ill., c. 60).

### § 44. Paul of Samosata, Malchion of Antioch, Lucian of Samosata.

1. PAUL OF SAMOSATA. — He was a «ducenarius» of Zenobia, queen of Palmyra, and from 260 held the see of Antioch. Apparently he committed to writing his teaching that Christ was by nature only an ordinary man [1]. Vincent of Lerins [2] was acquainted with «Opuscula» of Paul, and a later Greek writer has left us some Christological fragments of his discourses to Sabinus (*πρὸς Σαβῖνον λόγοι*).

*Mai*, Script. vet. nova coll. (1833), vii. 1 68 sq.; *Routh*, Reliquiae Sacrae (2) iii. 329 f. See *G. D. Rossini*, L'impresa di Palmira e Paolo Samosateno, in Miscellanea di Storia Eccles. (1902—1903), i. 109—133.

2. MALCHION OF ANTIOCH. — In consequence of the heresy of Paul three synods were held at Antioch from 264—269. It was only in the last of these synods that Malchion, a presbyter of Antioch and a famous teacher of rhetoric in that city, was able to convict the cunning sophist and to tear the mask from him. We have still some fragments of the discussion between Paul and Malchion, taken down by shorthand writers [3] Paul was deposed and excommunicated; in a long encyclical letter the synod made known to the entire Catholic Church the history and the conclusion of the whole affair. This encyclical letter, according to Jerome [4], was the work of Malchion; some fragments of it are extant in Eusebius [5] and in other writers.

For the remnants of the encyclical and the discussion see *Migne*, PG. x. 247—260, and *Routh*, l. c. iii. 300—316. Another fragment of the discussion is in *Pitra*, Analecta sacra iii. 600 f.; cf. the Syriac fragments, ib. iv. 183– 186 423—425. There is reason to doubt the genuineness of a letter written to Paul «before his deposition», by six bishops: Hymenæus (of Jerusalem), Theophilus, Theotecnus (of Cæsarea in Palestine), Maximus (of Bostra), Proclus and Bolanus (*Mansi*, Ss. Concil. Coll. i. 1033—1040; *Routh*, l. c., iii. 289—299). These six bishops are mentioned by Eusebius (Hist. eccl., vii. 30, 2) among those who forwarded the encyclical letter. Cf. *P. Pape*, Die Synoden von Antiochien 264—269 (Progr.), Berlin, 1903. For an English translation of the fragments of Malchion see *Salmond*, in Ante-Nicene Fathers (ed. Coxe, 1896), vi. 168—172.

3. LUCIAN OF SAMOSATA. — Lucian, a native of Samosata, presbyter of Antioch and founder of the Antiochene exegetical school, shared the views of Paul and was probably excommunicated at the

[1] *Eus.*, Hist. eccl., vii. 27, 2.
[2] Common. c. 25, al. 35.
[3] *Eus.*, Hist. eccl., vii. 29, 2.
[4] De viris ill., c. 71.
[5] *Eus.*, Hist. eccl., vii. 30.

same time as the latter. Although he returned to the communion of the Church, he did not cease to teach a decidedly subordinationist theology, and is the true father of Arianism. His martyrdom at Nicomedia (Jan. 7., 312) made reparation for his want of conformity to the teachings of the Church[1]. Like Hesychius (§ 41, 5) Lucian made a critical revision of the Septuagint and a recension of the text of the New Testament, or at least of the Gospels[2]. In the fourth century this revision of the Septuagint was still in general use through all the churches from Antioch to Constantinople[3]; manuscripts of it have survived to our day. Jerome[4] had read other works of Lucian: *De fide libelli* and *Breves ad nonnullos epistolae.* The *Chronicon Paschale*[5] cites the conclusion of a letter of Lucian sent from Nicomedia to the Christians of Antioch. The statement of Athanasius[6] and others that a profession of faith adopted by an Antiochene synod in 341 was the work of Lucian, is very questionable.

The edition of the Pentateuch and the historical books of the Jewish canon, published at Göttingen in 1883 by *P. de Lagarde,* was based on codices that *C. Vercellone* had recognized as correlated, and that *A. M. Ceriani* and *Fr. Field* had shown to be copies of Lucian's revision of the Septuagint. The Septuagint text in the Complutensian Polyglot is based on two of these codices. For more special information see the manuals of Introduction to the Old and New Testament. The fragments of other works of Lucian are in *Routh,* l. c., iv. 1—17. Among them are an Apology for Christianity, prepared at Nicomedia on the eve of his death, and taken from Rufinus' paraphrase of the Church History of Eusebius (ix. 6); also an oral exposition of Job ii. 9—10, taken from the commentary on Job by Julian of Halicarnassus. The hypothesis of *F. Kattenbusch* (Das apostolische Symbol, Leipzig, 1894, i. 252—273 392—395) that the baptismal symbol of the Apostolic Constitutions (vii. 41) is the work of Lucian, is most probably untenable. For Lucian see in general, Acta SS. Jan., Venice, 1734, i. 357—365, and *Harnack,* Gesch. der altchristl. Lit. i. 526—531; cf. *Stokes,* in Dict. of Christ. Biography, London, 1882, iii. 748—749, also (Cardinal) Newman's «History of the Arians».

### § 45. Pamphilus of Cæsarea and the Dialogus de recta in Deum fide.

1. PAMPHILUS. — The biography of St. Pamphilus in three books, by his disciple and friend Eusebius, has perished, only references to it and some quotations are known[7] But in his Church History and in his two works on the martyrs of Palestine, Eusebius has handed down to posterity tributes of affectionate remembrance for Pamphilus. He was born of noble parents at Berytus in Phœnicia, studied theology[8] at Alexandria under Pierius (§ 41, 2), took up his permanent residence at Cæsarea in Palestine, was ordained priest, opened in

[1] *Eus.,* Hist. eccl., viii. 13, 2; ix. 6, 3. [2] *Hier.,* Praef. in Evang.
[3] *Hier.,* Praef. in Paral. [4] De viris ill., c. 77.
[5] *Migne,* PG., xcii. 689. [6] Ep. de syn. c. 23.
[7] *Eus.,* De mart. Palestinae, c. 11, 3; *Hier.,* Adv. Rufin., i. 9.
[8] *Phot.,* Bibl. Cod. 118 119.

that city a theological school, and in the persecution of Maximinus suffered martyrdom there by decapitation (309), apparently after a long and tedious imprisonment. The greatest of his literary merits is the zeal he displayed for the enrichment and enlargement of the library of Cæsarea (§ 37). While in prison he wrote, with the help of his friend Eusebius, an apology for Origen *(ἀπολογία ὑπὲρ Ὠριγένους)* in five books to which, after the martyr's death, Eusebius added a sixth. The work was dedicated to the confessors in the mines or quarries of Palestine, and was an attempt to defend the theology of the Alexandrine from the charge of heterodoxy that many brought against it. Only the first of its six books has been preserved, and that in a not very reliable version by Rufinus of Aquileja. Photius speaks about the whole work [1]. The latter says quite positively that Pamphilus composed the first five books [2]. In view of this testimony the statement of St. Jerome [3] that the Arian Eusebius was the true author of the work, is manifestly inexact and awakens a suspicion of bias. Gennadius wrongly says [4] that Rufinus translated a work of Pamphilus *Adversum mathematicos;* he simply misunderstood the reasons given by Rufinus [5] for his translation of the first book of the Apology. Finally, in his biography of Pamphilus, Eusebius made mention of letters of Pamphilus to his friends [6]

For the «testimonia antiquorum» concerning Pamphilus see *Preuschen,* in *Harnack,* Gesch. der altchristl. Lit. i. 543—550. The Passio Ss. Pamphili et sociorum (*Migne,* PG. x. 1533—1550) is a fragment of the larger work of Eusebius on the Martyrs of Palestine, and has been re-edited by *H. Delehaye,* in Analecta Bollandiana (1897), xvi. 129—139. The translation by Rufinus of the first book of the Apology for Origen is found in the editions of Origen (*Migne,* PG., xvii. 521—616). It is also (incomplete) in *Routh,* Reliquiae Sacrae (2) iii. 485—512; iv. 339—392. For traces of biblical manuscripts written or corrected by Pamphilus cf. *W Bousset,* in Texte und Untersuchungen (1894), xi. 4, 45—73.

2. DIALOGUS DE RECTA IN DEUM FIDE. — There have come down to us in Greek and Latin texts, under the name of Origen, five dialogues against the Gnostics. Their Greek title is *διάλεξις Ἀδαμαντίου τοῦ καὶ Ὠριγένους περὶ τῆς εἰς θεὸν ὀρθῆς πίστεως*, while in the only manuscript that has reached us of the Latin version made by Rufinus they are called *Libri Adamantii Origenis adversus haereticos numero quinque.* In these dialogues Adamantius appears as the protagonist of Christian faith. In the first two he attacks the doctrine of three (or two) principles *(ἀρχαί)* as held by the Marcionites, Megethius and Marcus. In the last three dialogues he combats the theses of Marinus, a follower of Bardesanes. Marinus had maintained that the devil or

[1] Bibl. Cod. 118.
[2] Cf. *Eus.,* Hist. eccl., vi. 33, 4, and *Hier.,* De viris ill., c. 75.
[3] Adv. *Rufin.,* i. 8; al. [4] De viris ill., c. 17.
[5] Apol., i. 11. [6] *Hier.,* Adv. Ruf., i. 9.

evil could not have been created by God, that the Logos could not take a human body, that the body could not rise again. In the fourth dialogue he interrupts for a while the discussion with Marinus, in order to dispute with Droserius and Valens, followers of Valentinian, concerning the origin of evil. The Christian disputants had chosen as arbiter Eutropius, a learned heathen philosopher; he considers himself obliged to yield the palm of victory to Adamantius. The author of these dialogues is evidently very well-skilled in dialectic and theology Zahn has shown by a comparison of the Greek with the Latin text that in general the latter, though a translation, represents with fidelity the original work, while very plainly the Greek text has been worked over quite thoroughly. Internal evidence shows that the work was composed about 300—313; the revision must have taken place between 330 and 337 The author can no longer be recognized, but it is probable that he lived at or near Antioch. The erroneous attribution of the work to Origen, accepted by Basil the Great and Gregory of Nazianzus[1], is owing to a confusion of the Church's theological protagonist with the author of the dialogue. Very probably, indeed, the latter meant to indicate by the name Adamantius no other but Origen (cf. § 39, 1). At the same time his intention was to put forth the famous Alexandrine only as sponsor for the doctrine of the dialogue, not to designate him as the author of the work.

The Greek text has come down in seven (according to *von Bakhuyzen*) codices that go back to a single archetype. The editio princeps is that of *J. R. Wetstein,* Basle, 1674, reprinted in later editions of Origen (*Migne,* PG.. xi. 1711—1884). The Latin version was first published by *C. P. Caspari,* Kirchenhistorische Anecdota, Christiania, 1883, i. 1—129 (cf. iii—iv). For further details see *Th. Zahn,* in Zeitschr. f. Kirchengesch. (1887—1888), ix. 193—239, and Gesch. des neutestamentl. Kanons (1892), ii. 2, 419—426. There is a new edition by *W H. van de Sande Bakhuyzen,* Leipzig, 1901, in Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte.

### § 46. The Didascalia apostolorum.

Even before the Apostolic Church-Ordinance (§ 42) had been adopted in Egypt, there circulated in Syria or Palestine a pseudo-apostolic work of similar character, but much larger in size. Its subject-matter was, likewise, Christian morality, the constitution of the Church, and Christian discipline. The original Greek text has apparently perished. In 1854 P de Lagarde edited an ancient Syriac version, and recently Hauler has made known notable fragments of an early Latin version. These fragments confirm the conclusion of Funk that in general the Syriac version, apart from its peculiar division into chapters, faithfully represents the original Greek. The title (lacking in the Latin version) reads in Syriac: «Didascalia,

[1] Philocal. Orig. c. 24, 8.

i. e. the Catholic Doctrine of the Twelve Apostles and holy disciples of our Redeemer». It opens with general exhortatory advice to Christians (c. 1 in Syriac) and more particularly to those in certain states, especially married persons (cc. 2—3). Then follow provisions concerning the qualifications for the office of bishop, his duties and his rights (cc. 4—9), on lawsuits among Christians (cc. 10—11), on the liturgical assemblies (cc. 12—13), on widows, deacons and deaconesses (cc. 14—16), on the care of the poor and in particular of orphans (cc. 17—18), on the martyrs (cc. 19—20), on fasting (c. 21), on the discipline of children (c. 22). The last chapters contain a warning against heresies (cc. 23—25) and against Jewish or Judaizing practices (c. 26). There is no inner cohesion between the chapters; even in each chapter the thought of the writer does not progress in an orderly way. According to c. 24 the work was composed by the Apostles at Jerusalem, on the occasion of the apostolic council and during the first days after the same. Funk has shown that it was written in Syria or Palestine during the first half of the third century. The sources at the disposition of the writer were the Holy Scriptures (in c. 7 he even quotes the story of the woman taken in adultery, John vii. 53 to viii. 11), the Didache, the collection of the Ignatian Epistles, the Dialogue of Justin the Martyr, the apocryphal Gospel of Peter, the fourth book of the Sibylline Oracles, and perhaps the «Memorabilia» of Hegesippus. The work was highly esteemed and much used in Syria and Palestine. Early in the fifth century it was worked over in Syria at considerable length, and took its actual shape in the first six books of the Apostolic Constitutions (§ 75, 1).

The Syriac version was edited from a codex of the ninth or tenth century by *P. Bötticher (P. de Lagarde),* Didascalia Apostolorum syriace, Leipzig, 1854. At the same time, in the work of *Chr. C. J. Bunsen,* Analecta Ante-Nicaena, London, 1854, ii, *Bötticher* undertook to reconstruct the original Greek of the Didascalia (225—338: Didascalia purior). For this purpose he used the Syriac version and the first six books of the Apostolic Constitutions; the six books were so printed as to distinguish by different kinds of type the original text from the additions to it (45—224). In many details, however, both these recensions of Bötticher are untrustworthy; cf. *Funk,* Die Apostolischen Konstitutionen, Rottenburg, 1891, pp. 40—50. On Didascaliae apostolorum fragmenta Veronensia Latina ed. *E. Hauler,* Leipzig, 1900, i, see *Funk,* l. c., pp. 28—75. For the dependence of the Didascalia on the Didache see *C. Holzhey,* in Compte rendu du IV[e] Congrès scientifique internat. des Catholiques, Fribourg (Switzerland), 1898, Section I, 249—277; on its relations to the Ignatian Epistles see *Holzhey,* in Theol. Quartalschr. (1898), lxxx. 380—396. *F. X. Funk,* La date de la Didascalie des Apôtres, in Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique (1901), ii. 798—809; here he assigns it to the second half of the third century. *P. Corssen,* Zur lateinischen Didascalia Apostolorum, in Zeitschr. für neutestamentl. Wissensch. (1900), i. 339—343. In the Canoniste Contemporain (1900—1902) *F. Nau* gives a French

version of the Didascalia (reprinted, Paris, 1902). *A. Jakoby*, Ein bisher unbeachteter apokrypher Bericht über die Taufe Jesu, nebst Beiträgen zur Geschichte der Didascalia der zwölf Apostel, und Erläuterungen zu den Darstellungen der Taufe Jesu, Straßburg, 1902; *C. Holzhey*, Dionysius der Große und die Didascalia, in Theol.-praktische Monatschr. (1901), xi. 515—523; cf. § 40, 4. The Didascalia Apostolorum, edited from a Mesopotamian manuscript with various readings and collations from other mss. by *M. Dunlop Gibson*, I: Syriac text; II. an English version (Horae Semiticae), Cambridge, 1903. See the critique of *Funk*, in Theol. Quartalschr. (1903), lxxxv. 195—202. *A. Baumstark*, Die Urgestalt der arabischen Didascalia der Apostel, in Oriens Christianus (1903), pp. 201 to 208. For a German translation and commentary see *Achelis* and *Flemming*, Die syrische Didascalia, übersetzt und erklärt, in Texte und Untersuchungen, Leipzig, 1904, x, 2, VIII—388. Funk has also published what will in all likelihood ever remain the standard edition of the «Didascalia et Constitutiones Apostolorum», 2 voll., Paderborn, 1905.

## C. WRITERS OF ASIA MINOR.

### § 47. St. Gregory Thaumaturgus (the Wonder-Worker).

1. HIS LIFE. — In his panegyric on Origen (cc. 5—6) St. Gregory gives us reliable information concerning his own early life. Other details are gathered from Eusebius, St. Basil the Great, St. Jerome, Rufinus and other writers. His life in Greek by St. Gregory of Nyssa[1] is of little historical value because of its highly legendary character. Untrustworthy, too, is an ancient anonymous life in Syriac, that has come down to us in a sixth-century manuscript, and is in its contents very closely related to the Greek life. Both these lives may go back to an earlier Greek original (Ryssel), or both may represent the same stage of oral tradition (Koetschau). Gregory, in youth called Theodore[2], was born about 213 at Neocæsarea in Pontus, of a very noble heathen family. He devoted himself to the study of rhetoric and Roman law. In order to perfect themselves in the latter study, both he and his younger brother Athenodorus were on the point of entering the law schools of Berytus in Phœnicia, when domestic circumstances altered perforce their resolution, and they betook themselves to Cæsarea in Palestine. Here, very probably in 233, they became acquainted with Origen, and were fascinated by his teaching. Gradually all thought of Berytus and jurisprudence vanished from the minds of the impressionable youths. They clung thenceforth to the admirable teacher who had won them over to the studies of philosophy and theology, and at the same time converted them to Jesus Christ. Eusebius tells us[3] that Gregory and his brother spent five years at Cæsarea. On their separation from Origen, in 238, the former delivered a public panegyric or formal profession of gratitude in the presence of

[1] *Migne*, PG., xlvi. 893—958. [2] *Eus.*, Hist. eccl., vi. 30. [3] Ib.

his master[1]. Shortly afterwards they were both made bishops in Pontus[2]; Gregory in particular, became the first bishop of his native city of Neocæsarea. The two biographies already referred relate a long series of miraculous happenings, to which Gregory owes his later title of Wonder-Worker *(ὁ θαυματουργός)*. This very early growth of legend testifies more forcibly than any historical document could to his uncommonly superior personality and his far-reaching successful labors. Gregory and Athenodorus took part in the Antiochene synod (264—265) that condemned Paul of Samosata[3]; they may also have been present at the two following synods held for the same purpose[4]. Suidas says[5] that Gregory died in the reign of Aurelian (270—275). Before his death he had completely converted his native city, and all Pontus continued to reverence his memory[6].

The Syriac biography of Gregory was first published in a German version by *V Ryssel,* in Theol. Zeitschr. aus der Schweiz (1894), xi. 228 to 254. Later, the Syriac text was published from the same codex, by *P. Bedjan,* in Acta martyrum et sanctorum (1896), vi. 83—106. For the relations between the Greek and Syriac text see *P. Koetschau,* in Zeitschr. für wissenschaftl. Theol. (1898), xli. 211—250, and *H. Hilgenfeld,* ib., 452—456. For the latest researches on the life of Gregory cf. *Ryssel,* Gregorius Thaumaturgus, Leipzig, 1880, pp. 1—22, and *Koetschau,* in his edition of the Panegyric on Origen, Freiburg, 1894 (Sammlung ausgew. kirchen- und dogmengeschichtl. Quellenschriften 9), pp. v—xxi.

2. LITERARY LABORS. — Taken up with pastoral cares, Gregory wrote but little, as far as we know; what remains from his pen is mostly of an occasional character, and was called forth by practical needs. However, even in antiquity the labors of others were attributed to him and sometimes with fraudulent purpose.

The collected writings of Gregory were first edited by *G. Voss,* Mainz, 1604; then by *Fronton du Duc,* Paris, 1622. They are in *Gallandi,* Bibl. vet. Patr. iii. 377—469 (cf. iii. Proleg., xxv—xxix; xiv. app. 119), and in *Migne,* PG., x. 963—1232. Several writings and fragments, partly unknown, have been recently edited by *P. de Lagarde* and *P. Martin,* from Syriac and Armenian sources; they bear the name of Gregory, and an account of those printed before 1880 may be read in the careful study of *Ryssel,* Gregorius Thaumaturgus (cf. additional material in Jahrb. f. protest. Theol. 1881, vii. 565 sq.). There is an English translation of the literary remains of Gregory by *Salmond,* in Ante-Nicene Fathers (ed. Coxe, 1896), vi. 9—74.

3. GENUINE WORKS. — The following works may and ought to be recognized as genuine writings: a) The Panegyric on Origen, delivered at Cæsarea in 238, at the time of his leave-taking. It is entitled in the editions[7]: *εἰς Ὠριγένην προσφωνητικὸς καὶ πανηγυρικὸς λόγος*, but is called by the author (c. 3, 31; 4, 40) *λόγος χαριστήριος*, or «discourse of thanksgiving». The thanks of the speaker are directed

[1] *Hier.,* De viris ill., c. 65. [2] *Eus.,* Hist. eccl., vi. 30.
[3] Ib., vii. 28, 1. [4] Ib., vii. 28, 2. [5] Lexicon, s. v. Gregor.
[6] *Basil. M.,* De Spir. Sancto, c. 29, 74. [7] *Migne,* PG., x. 1049—1104.

first to God, the Giver of all good, then to the guardian angel who accompanied Gregory and Athenodorus to Cæsarea, and finally to the great teacher who inspired both with a love for (Christian) philosophy. A strong current of living and affectionate emotion pulsates through the entire discourse. Its diction is comparatively pure and noble, in spite of a certain straining after rhetorical effect. b) The Creed of Gregory *(ἔκθεσις τῆς πίστεως)*[1]. According to the legendary life by St. Gregory of Nyssa[2] this formula of faith was revealed to him in a vision by the Apostle John, at the command of the Mother of God. Caspari has shown that it was composed between 260 and 270. It is a brief but clear and precise exposition of the Christian doctrine of the Trinity. c) The so-called Canonical Epistle (*ἐπιστολὴ κανονική*; with the *scholia* of the canonists Balsamon and Zonaras)[3]. It was written to solve the doubts of a bishop as to the proper treatment of those Christians who had been guilty of infractions of Christian discipline and morality during the raids of the Goths and Boradi (Borani) into Pontus and Bithynia. The document is of importance first for the history of ancient ecclesiastical discipline, then as affording evidence of the mildness and tact of Gregory. Dräseke thinks it was composed in the autumn of 254. d) The Metaphrase of Ecclesiastes *(μετάφρασις εἰς τὸν ἐκκλησιαστὴν Σολομῶντος)*[4], a paraphrastic rendering of the Greek text of the sacred book. The manuscripts usually attribute it to St. Gregory of Nazianzus, but St. Jerome[5] and Rufinus[6] declare it to be a work of St. Gregory Thaumaturgus. e) The work «To Theopompus on the divine incapacity and capacity of suffering», extant in Syriac only, a philosophical colloquy as to whether the divine immunity from suffering carries with it necessarily an indifference to the affairs of mankind. The contents of this work suggest no reason to doubt its genuineness; it was probably composed before his consecration as bishop of Neocæsarea. Theopompus, otherwise unknown, is described (c. 6) as a follower of «Isocrates», whom Dräseke identifies with Socrates, a Gnostic and a Marcionite[7] The latter taught that from all eternity God was essentially in a state of absolute quietude and nowise concerned himself about mankind. f) Lost writings, especially a dialogue with Ælianus *(πρὸς Αἰλιανὸν διάλεξις)* intended to win over the latter to the Christian faith, it seems to have dwelt particularly on the Christian teaching concerning God[8]; also some lost *epistolae*[9] of which we have no further knowledge.

[1] *Migne,* PG., x. 983—988.
[2] *Greg. Nyss.*, Vita S. Thaumat.; *Migne,* PG., xlvi. 909 ff.
[3] *Migne,* PG., x. 1019—1048. [4] Ib., x. 987--1018.
[5] De viris ill., c. 65; Comm. in Eccl. ad iv. 13 ff.
[6] Hist. eccl. Eus., vii. 25.
[7] Dial. de recta in Deum fide, sect. 1; *Migne,* PG., xi. 1729.
[8] *Basil. Magn.,* Ep. 210, 5. [9] *Hier.,* De viris ill., c. 65.

a) The «Discourse of Thanksgiving» has reached us only by means of the manuscripts in which it is joined to the work of Origen against Celsus (§ 39, 6). For excellent separate editions we are indebted to *J. A. Bengel,* Stuttgart, 1722, and *P Koetschau.* A German version of the Panegyric, the Creed and the Canonical Epistle was made by *J. Margraf,* Kempten, 1875 (Bibl. der Kirchenväter). — b) The Creed has come down to us in Greek through a work of Gregory of Nyssa (l. c.), and in many manuscripts; we possess it also in a Syriac version and in two early Latin versions, one by Rufinus of Aquileja, the other anonymous. For all these texts and an exhaustive demonstration of the genuineness and integrity of this Creed see *C. P. Caspari,* Alte und neue Quellen zur Gesch. des Taufsymbols und der Glaubensregel, Christiania, 1879, pp. 1—64. The Syriac text is also in *Pitra,* Analecta sacra (1883), iv. 81 345 f. — c) The Canonical Epistle is found in *Routh,* Reliquiae Sacrae (2) iii. 251—283; in *Pitra,* Iuris eccles. Graecorum historia et monumenta, Rome, 1864, i. 562—566, and in *Dräseke,* Jahrb. f. protest. Theologie (1881), vii. 724—756. — d) For the Metaphrase of Ecclesiastes cf. *Ryssel,* Gregorius Thaumaturgus, pp. 27—29. — e) The work «To Theopompus» is printed, in *P. de Lagarde,* Analecta Syriaca, Leipzig and London, pp. 46—64, from a Syriac codex of the sixth century; a German version is given by *Ryssel,* l. c., pp. 71—99 (cf. pp. 118—124 137 f. 150—157). Another edition of the Syriac text is that of *P. Martin,* in *Pitra,* Analecta sacra, iv. 103—120 363—376. Cf. *Dräseke,* Gesammelte Patrist. Untersuchungen, Altona and Leipzig, 1889, pp. 162—168. — f) The Arabic fragment of a Sermo de Trinitate (*Migne,* PG., x. 1123—1126; *Ryssel,* l. c., 43—46), in which *Mai* thought he saw a fragment of the dialogue with Ælianus, is spurious.

4. DUBIOUS WORKS. — Other writings or fragments await a more thorough study of their contents and character: a) The brief treatise on the soul addressed to Tatian (*λόγος κεφαλαιώδης περὶ ψυχῆς πρὸς Τατιανόν*)[1]. It discusses the existence and nature of the soul, and expressly prescinds from scriptural proof. In modern times it has been customary to look on it as spurious, even as of mediæval origin. Recently a Syriac version has been discovered in a codex of the seventh century; it is also possible that Procopius of Gaza (about 465—528) cites the Greek text as a work of our Gregory b) We owe to P Martin the knowledge of five homilies, preserved only in Armenian and attributed to Gregory. They are: *Homilia in nativitatem Christi. Sermo de incarnatione, Laus S. Dei genitricis et semper Virginis Mariae, Panegyricus sermo in S. Dei genitricem et semper Virginem Mariam, Sermo panegyricus in honorem S. Stephani protomartyris.* The last four are certainly products of a much later age. Loofs concedes the first to be a genuine work of Gregory, moved by numerous points of contact with the work «To Theopompus». Conybeare translated into English, also from the Armenian, a sixth homily, and holds it to be a genuine discourse of Gregory. c) A multitude of loose fragments, mostly spurious and insignificant; here and there, however, a genuine phrase may lie hidden among them.

[1] *Migne,* PG., x. 1137—1146.

a) See *A. Smith Lewis,* in Studia Sinaitica, London, 1894, i. 19—26, for a Syriac version of the treatise «on the soul». It lacks only the introduction; the codex is of the seventh century. A German version is given by *Ryssel,* in Rhein. Mus. f. Philol., new series (1896), li. 4—9, cf. 318—320. The testimony of Procopius is treated by *Dräseke,* in Zeitschr. für wissenschaftl. Theol. (1896), xxxix. 166—169, and Zur Gregor von Neocæsareas Schrift über die Seele, in Zeitschr. für wissenschaftl. Theol. (1901), xliv. 87—100. — b) The five Armenian homilies are in *Pitra,* Analecta sacra, iv. 134—145 156—169 (Armenian); 386—396 404—412 (Latin). Cf. *Loofs,* in Theol. Literaturzeitung (1884), pp. 551—553. The Armenian homily was translated into English by *F. C. Conybeare,* in The Expositor (1896), i. 161—173. *S. Haidacher,* Zu den Homilien des Gregorius von Antiochia und des Gregorius Thaumaturgus, in Zeitschr. f. kath. Theol. (1901), xxv. 367—369. — c) For the scattered fragments of the writings of Gregory see *Ryssel,* Gregorius Thaumaturgus, pp. 43—59, and for the Greek and Syriac fragments, in particular, see *Pitra,* l. c., iii. 589—595; iv. 133 386, and *Loofs,* l. c., 550 f.

5. SPURIOUS WORKS. — A number of works have been erroneously attributed to Gregory. a) The Syriac work «To Philagrius on consubstantiality» is simply, as was seen by Dräseke, the Letter *πρὸς Εὐάγριον μοναχὸν περὶ θεότητος,* published among the works of St. Gregory of Nazianzus[1] and St. Gregory of Nyssa[2], and probably not written before 350—400. b) The «Sectional Confession of Faith, *ἡ κατὰ μέρος πίστις*[3], an exposition of doctrine concerning the Blessed Trinity and the Incarnation of the Son, is not a work of Gregory. Caspari has proved that it was composed by Apollinaris of Laodicea (about 380), and circulated by the Apollinarists under the safe cover of Gregory's reputation. c) The «Twelve Chapters on Faith», *κεφάλαια περὶ πίστεως δώδεκα*[4]. This little work proposes to expound the orthodox faith concerning the Incarnation. It is anti-Apollinarist (cc. 10—11) and was probably not written before the end of the fourth century. d) Five Greek homilies — three on the Annunciation[5], one on Epiphany[6] and one on the Feast of All Saints[7] — are all spurious.

a) The Syriac text of the work «To Philagrius» is found in *de Lagarde,* Anal. Syr. pp. 43—46, and *Pitra,* Analecta sacra, iv. 100—103. A German version is given in *Ryssel,* Gregorius Thaumaturgus, pp. 65—70 (cf. pp. 100 to 118 135 ff. 147 ff.), and a Latin version in *Pitra,* l. c., iv. 360—363. For the origin of that work see (in opposition to *Ryssel,* in Jahrb. für protest. Theol. [1881], vii. 565—573) *Dräseke,* Gesammelte Patrist. Untersuchungen (1889), pp. 103—162. — b) The «Sectional Confession of Faith» may also be found in *de Lagarde's* Edition of the Greek work of Titus Bostrensis «Against the Manichæans», Berlin, 1859, pp. 103—113. For a literal Syriac version see *de Lagarde,* Analecta Syriaca, pp. 31—42, and *Pitra, l.* c., iv. 82—93 346—356 (Syriac and Latin). Cf. *Caspari,* Alte und neue Quellen, pp. 65—146. — c) For fragments of a Syriac

[1] *Migne,* PG., xxxvii. 383.
[2] Ib., xlvi. 1101—1108.
[3] Ib., x. 1103—1124.
[4] Ib., x. 1127—1136.
[5] Ib., x. 1145—1178.
[6] Ib., x. 1177—1190.
[7] Ib., x. 1197—1206.

version of the Twelve Chapters etc. cf. *de Lagarde*, l. c., pp. 65—67, and *Pitra*, l. c., iv. 95—100 357—360. Concerning these «Chapters» consult (against *Dräseke*, l. c. pp. 78—102) *Funk*, Kirchengeschichtl. Abhandlungen und Untersuchungen (1899), ii. 329—338; *Fr. Lauchert*, in Theol. Quartalschr. (1900), lxxxii. 395—418. — d) The first of the «Five Homilies» is extant also in Syriac (*Pitra*, l. c., iv. 122—127 377—381) and in Armenian (ib., pp. 145—150 396—400), the second also in Armenian (ib., pp. 150—156 400—404); there is also (ib., pp. 127—133 381—386) a Syriac text of the fourth homily. The arguments of *Dräseke*, in Jahrb. für protest. Theol. (1884), x. 657 ff., in favor of the authorship of Apollinaris of Laodicea for the first two and the fourth homilies are not conclusive.

6. ATHENODORUS. — In his *Sacra Parallela* St. John Damascene attributes without further identification three fragments of a work περὶ ἐβραϊσμοῦ to a certain Athenodorus. It may have been written by Athenodorus, the brother of St. Gregory Thaumaturgus. Cf. *K. Holl*, in Texte und Untersuchungen, xx, new series (1899), v. 2, 161.

7. FIRMILIAN OF CÆSAREA (Cappadocia). — About the middle of the third century he appears as one of the most highly esteemed bishops of the East (*Eus.*, Hist. eccl., vii. 30, 3—5). His death is placed in 269. We have from his pen a long letter to St. Cyprian of Carthage relative to the Western controversy concerning the baptism of heretics, in a Latin version. It is printed among the letters of Cyprian (no. 75, ed. *Hartel*, ii. 810 to 827). In this letter he gives his unreserved approval to the position of St. Cyprian, declares invalid all baptism by heretics, and denounces with passionate invective the judgment of Pope Stephen. *J. Ernst* has shown, in Zeitschrift für kath. Theol. (1894), xviii. 209—259; (1896), xx. 364—367, that it is impossible to defend the interpolation-hypothesis put forward by *O. Ritschl*, in Cyprian von Karthago und die Verfassung der Kirche, Göttingen, 1885, pp. 126—134. St. Basil the Great mentions (De Spir. Sancto, cc. 29 74) other works (λόγοι) of Firmilian. Cf. *B. Bossue*, in Acta SS. Oct. (1867), xii. 470—510.

## § 48. St. Methodius of Olympus.

1. HIS LIFE. — It is hidden in almost complete obscurity In his Church History, Eusebius does not honor with a mention this enemy of Origen. We know only that he was bishop of Olympus in Lycia and that he died about 311 a martyr's death in the persecution of Maximinus Daza[1]. The rumor in St. Jerome[2] that he was at first bishop of Olympus and was then translated to Tyre (in Phœnicia), also the later tradition in Leontius of Byzantium[3] that he was bishop of Patara (in Lycia), are apparently the results of a misunderstanding.

*A. Pankow*, Methodius, Bischof von Olympus, in Katholik (1887), ii. 1—28 113—142 225—250 (reprint, Mainz, 1888). Concerning the episcopal see of Methodius see *Th. Zahn*, in Zeitschr. für Kirchengesch. (1885 to 1886), viii. 15—20. *C. G. Lundberg*, Methodius, biskop of Olympos, en Studie i de förnicenska patristiken, Stockholm, 1901.

[1] *Hier.*, De viris ill., c. 83; cf. *Socr.*, Hist. eccl, vi. 13.
[2] L. c. [3] De sectis, iii. 1.

2. WRITINGS OF METHODIUS. — Unlike St. Gregory Thaumaturgus Methodius considered that literary labors were one of the most important phases of his life-work. Of his writings, however, only one has reached us in its complete Greek text. Others have come down, in abbreviated shape, through an Old-Slavonic version of the eleventh century Though diffuse, he is judged by St. Jerome[1] to be a pleasing and elegant writer. He is remarkable for formal beauty of diction and delights in imitating Plato, even to the choice of dialogue as the medium of his thoughts. His dogmatic-historical importance is principally due to his energetic and successful fight against Origenism.

His writings, entire and fragmentary, were collected by *Fr. Combefis,* Paris, 1644; they are reprinted in *Gallandi,* Bibl. vet. Patr. (1767), iii. 663—832 (cf. Proleg., li.—liv.), and in *Migne,* PG., xviii. 9—408, also in *A. Jahn,* S. Methodii opera et S. Methodius platonizans, Halle, 1865. A German version of the Old-Slavonic *Corpus Methodianum* and a new edition of most of the Greek fragments were made by *G. N. Bonwetsch,* Methodius von Olympus, i. Schriften, Erlangen and Leipzig, 1891. There is an English translation of the works of Methodius by *W. R. Clark,* in Ante-Nicene Fathers (ed. Coxe, 1896), vi. 309—402. See *Preuschen,* in *Harnack,* Gesch. der altchristl. Lit., i. 468—478; *G. Fritschel,* Methodius von Olympus und seine Philosophie (Inaug.-Diss.), Leipzig, 1879. *L. Atzberger,* Gesch. der christl. Eschatologie innerhalb der vornicänischen Zeit, Freiburg, 1896, pp. 469—490; *G. N. Bonwetsch,* Die Theologie des Methodius von Olympus untersucht (Abhandlungen der k. Gesellschaft der Wissensch. zu Göttingen), Berlin, 1903.

3. WORKS OF METHODIUS IN GREEK. — «The Banquet or on Virginity» *(συμπόσιον ἢ περὶ ἁγνείας)*[2] is an imitation of the «Banquet» of Plato. The virgin Gregorium relates to the author Eubulius (i. e. Methodius) the story of a banquet in the gardens of Arete at which ten virgins glorify chastity in lengthy discourses upon that subject. At the end Thecla, the eighth speaker, to whom Arete had given the prize, intones a hymn to the bridegroom Christ and to His bride the Church. The dialogue of Methodius «on the Freedom of the will» *(περὶ τοῦ αὐτεξουσίου)* is almost completely extant in the original Greek. We have already mentioned (§ 33, 6) a very important fragment; there is extant also a somewhat defective version in Old-Slavonic. In this work an orthodox Christian attacks the Gnostic dualism and determinism represented by two followers of Valentinian. He denies the eternity of matter as a principle of evil; the latter is rather the result of the free will of rational creatures. The Greek text of the prolix dialogue, in three books, on the Resurrection, originally perhaps entitled Ἰγλαοφῶν ἢ περὶ ἀναστάσεως, has mostly perished; some fragments of the original are yet extant. There exists, however, in Old-Slavonic, a complete version, save that the second and third books

[1] *Hier.,* De viris ill., c. 83. [2] *Migne,* PG., xviii. 27—220.

have suffered abbreviation. The scene of the dialogue is at Patara, in the house of the physician Aglaophon; the subject of the discussion is the problem «whether after death this body will rise again to incorruptibility» (1, 1, 8). Aglaophon and Proclus side with Origen in denying the identity of the risen body with that of our present state, while Eubulius (Methodius) and Memianus defend the ecclesiastical teaching. Methodius[1] was unable to finish this work on the lines of his original plan; it merited and enjoyed, nevertheless, the esteem of many.

The «Banquet» was first edited by *L. Allatius,* Rome, 1656. *E. Carel,* S. Methodii Patarensis convivium decem virginum (Thèse), Paris, 1880. On the hymn at the end of the «Banquet» cf. *Krumbacher,* Gesch. der byzant. Liter. (2) pp. 653 697. For the dialogue on «Free Will» in Greek and Slavonic (also a German version) cf. *Bonwetsch,* l. c., pp. 1—62; cf xiv—xxii. The dialogue on the Resurrection is found ib., pp. 70—283; cf. xxiii—xxx. 349. Syriac fragments of this dialogue are printed in *Pitra,* Analecta sacra, iv. 201—205 434—438.

4. WRITINGS PRESERVED IN OLD-SLAVONIC. — In addition to the dialogues on Free Will and the Resurrection there are four other tractates in the Old-Slavonic *Corpus Methodianum:* «On life and rational activity» *(De vita),* an exhortation to contentment with the present life and to hope for the future; «On the difference of foods and the young cow mentioned in Leviticus» (rather in Numb. xix) *(De cibis),* an allegorico-typical interpretation of the food-ordinances of the Old Testament and the law of the sacrifice of the red cow (see § 39, 14) addressed to two women, Frenope and Kilonia; To Sistelius on leprosy *(De lepra),* a dialogue between Eubulius (Methodius) and Sistelius on the spiritual sense of the legislation concerning leprosy in Lev. xiii; «On the bloodsucker mentioned in Proverbs, and on the words 'the heavens shew forth the glory of God'» *(De sanguisuga),* an exposition of Prov. xxx. 15 ff. (cf. xxiv. 50 ff.) and Ps. xviii. 2 (Septuagint). It was addressed to a certain Eustachius.

The Old-Slavonic text of these tractates is given in a German version by *Bonwetsch,* l. c. The Greek fragments of the work on leprosy printed by *Bonwetsch* (pp. 311—325) prove conclusively that the Slavonic text has been abbreviated and mutilated. For the contents of these treatises see Abhandlgn., Al. v. Öttingen zum 70. Geburtstag gewidmet, Munich, 1898, pp. 29—53.

5. LOST WRITINGS. — In the *De sanguisuga* (10, 4) Methodius announces to his friend Eustachius a work «On the body». St. Jerome mentions[2] four works that no longer exist: *Adversum Porphyrium libri,* an extensive refutation of the fifteen books written against the Christians by that Neoplatonist philosopher[3]; *Adversus Origenem de*

[1] De cibis, c. 1, 1. [2] De viris ill., c. 83.
[3] *Hier.,* Ep. 48, 13; 70, 3; al.

*pythonissa*, or on the Witch of Endor, in opposition to the homily of Origen on the same subject (§ 39, 4); *In Genesim et In Canticum canticorum commentarii*. Theodoret of Cyrus mentions[1] a «discourse on the martyrs» *(περὶ τῶν μαρτύρων λόγος)*. It is probable that the dialogue entitled Xenon, mentioned by Socrates[2] is identical with the work «On created things» *(περὶ τῶν γενητῶν)*, fragments of which have been preserved by Photius[3], against the work of Origen «On the eternity of the world» defended, as it seems, by Xenon. Some fragments of the *scholia* of Methodius on the book of Job are met with in the Catenæ.

For the fragments of the work against Porphyry see *Bonwetsch*, l. c., pp. 345—348. To the same work must belong the pretended *excerpta tria ex homilia S. Methodii de cruce et passione Christi*, in *Migne*, PG., xviii. 397—404. See *Preuschen*, l. c., i. 478, for the fragments of the commentary on Genesis and the Canticle of canticles. Two sentences of the work «On the Martyrs» are printed in *Bonwetsch*, l. c., p. 349. Cf. ib., pp. 349—354, the fullest collection of the *scholia* on Job.

6. SPURIOUS WORKS. — The orations *De Simeone et Anna*[4], *In ramos palmarum*[5] and *In ascensionem Domini Nostri Iesu Christi*, are spurious; the last exists only in Armenian and in a fragmentary state.

The last of these orations is found in *Pitra*, Analecta sacra, iv. 207—209 439—441.

## CHAPTER II.

## THE WESTERN WRITERS.

### § 49. General Considerations.

As early as the third century the ecclesiastical literature of the West exhibits certain native peculiarities. Its organ is the Latin, not the Greek tongue, and a distinctly Roman spirit dominates its contents. There reigns throughout its products a sober and practical spirit. The idealism of the Greek writings, their tendency to speculation and dialectic are not entirely foreign to this Latin Christian literature; yet its direct purpose is the immediately necessary or useful. Withal, it exhibits versatility and variety in a degree that almost astonishes the reader. Owing to the circumstances of the times the apologetic element is supreme. In the writings of Tertullian and in the (Greek) writings of Hippolytus anti-heretical polemic abounds. Exegesis is represented chiefly by Hippolytus and Victorinus of Pettau. Commodianus leads the procession of Christian poets in the Latin tongue. It is worthy of note that the Western writers are few, and that of the small number the majority comes from Northern Africa.

[1] Dial. 1; opp. ed. *Schultze*, iv. 55. [2] Hist. eccl., vi. 13.
[3] Bibl. Cod. 235. [4] *Migne*, PG., xviii. 347—382.
[5] Ib., 383—398.

## A. AFRICAN WRITERS.

### § 50. Tertullian.

1. HIS LIFE. — Quintus Septimius Florens Tertullianus was born, it is usually believed, about the year 160 at Carthage, where his father was serving as a centurion *(centurio proconsularis)* in the service of the proconsul of Africa[1] He received an excellent academic training and probably entered upon the career of an advocate[2] There are in the Pandects some excerpts from the writings of a jurist Tertullian *(Quaestionum libri* viii, *De castrensi peculio)* whom many historians are inclined to identify with our ecclesiastical writer About 193, certainly before 197, he became a Christian, was ordained also a priest according to St. Jerome[3], and began a long literary career in the service of the new faith. About midway in his life (ca. 202) he openly joined the sect of the Montanists, and began to attack the Catholic Church with a violence scarcely inferior to that which he had manifested against heathenism. Within the Montanist fold he founded a special sect known as Tertullianists[4] He is said to have lived to a very advanced age[5].

*C. E. Freppel,* Tertullien, 2 voll., Paris, 1864; 3. ed. 1886. *F. Böhringer,* Die Kirche Christi und ihre Zeugen, 2. ed., iii.—iv: Die lateinisch-afrikanische Kirche. Tertullianus, Cyprianus (Stuttgart, 1864); 2. ed. 1873. *A. Hauck,* Tertullians Leben und Schriften, Erlangen, 1877. *E. Nöldechen,* Tertullian, Gotha, 1890. Cf. *Nöldechen,* Die Abfassungszeit der Schriften Tertullians, Leipzig, 1888 (Texte und Untersuchungen, v. 2). In these two books Nöldechen collected the results of investigations previously published in several theological and historical reviews. — *Schanz,* Geschichte der röm. Literatur (1896), iii. 240—302. *P. Monceaux,* Histoire littéraire de l'Afrique chrétienne. I: Tertullien, Paris, 1901. *H. Kellner* and *G. Esser,* in Kirchenlexikon, 2. ed., xi. 1389—1426. — On the Jurist Tertullian cf. *Schanz,* l. c., iii. 182.

2. HIS LITERARY LABORS. — Tertullian is the most prolific of all the Latin writers, he is also the most original and personal. Ebert says well that perhaps no author has ever more fully justified than Tertullian the phrase of Buffon that the style is the man, for there never was a man that spoke more from his heart. He lives habitually in an atmosphere of conflict with others and with himself. He is quite conscious of this weakness. «Unhappy me!» he cries out on one occasion, «always burning with the fever of impatience» — *miserrimus ego semper uror caloribus impatientiae*[6]. All his extant writings, it may be said, are polemical. They fall easily into three groups: apologetic, in defence of Christianity or

[1] *Hier.,* De viris ill., c. 53. [2] *Eus.*. Hist. eccl., ii. 2, 4.
[3] De viris ill., c. 53. [4] *Aug.,* De haer., c. 86.
[5] *Hier.,* l. c.: fertur vixisse usque ad decrepitam aetatem.
[6] De pat. c. 1.

against heathenism and Judaism; dogmatico-polemic, in refutation of heresy in general and of certain heretics; practico-ascetical, dealing with various questions of Christian morality and discipline. Even in these writings the polemical element, or a highly personal note, is always present, whether he writes as a Catholic carried away with holy zeal yet harshly rigoristic, or as a Montanist overflowing with passionate rage against the pretended laxity of the Catholic Church. Tertullian is ever a powerful adversary, a man of burning eloquence, biting satire, compact and forcible logic. As a rule he over-shoots the mark, and fails to attain his immediate purpose[1]. As a writer he is without moderation, contemptuous of all compromise, proving frequently more than is needed; the reader is carried away rather than persuaded by his argument, he is hushed by the fine display of wit, but remains unconvinced and antagonistic.

In expression Tertullian is concise and bold, solid and rugged, involved and obscure. He has no sense for beauty of form; he deliberately scoffs at the refined diction of a Minucius Felix (§ 24). He seizes with pleasure on popular expressions; in a moment of embarrassment he is daringly creative and suddenly enriches the vocabulary of the Latin tongue. The theology of the Western Christians is indebted to him for many of its technical terms.

The manuscript tradition of the writings of Tertullian is very imperfect. Only the *Apologeticum* has come down in numerous codices, some of them quite ancient; a whole series of his other writings has been preserved only through the *Codex Agobardinus* (Parisiensis) of the ninth century. The works *De baptismo, De ieiunio* and *De pudicitia* are now without any manuscript evidence or guarantee. His writings, as far as we possess them, must have appeared between 195 and 218. For each of them the actual date is doubtful or much disputed; there are no certain points of comparison. However, it is usually possible to say whether a given work belongs to his Catholic or his Montanist period.

For the manuscripts of the writings of Tertullian see *Preuschen*, in *Harnack*, Gesch. der altchristl. Literatur, i. 675–677, and *E. Kroymann*, Die Tertullian-Überlieferung in Italien, Wien, 1898 (Sitzungsberichte der phil.-histor. Kl. der kgl. Akad. der Wissensch. zu Wien, cxxxviii. — Complete editions of his works were published by *B. Rhenanus*, Basle, 1521, and often since (cf. *A. Horawitz*, in the above-mentioned Sitzungsberichten, 1872, lxxi. 662—674); *J. Pamelius*, Antwerp., 1579; *N. Rigaltius*, Paris, 1634; *J. S. Semler*, Halle, 1769—1776, 6 voll.; *Migne*, PL., Paris, 1844, i.—ii.; *Fr. Öhler*, Leipzig, 1851—1854, 3 voll., and also *(editio minor)*, Leipzig, 1854 (cf. *Klussmann*, in Zeitschr. für wissensch. Theol. [1860], iii. 82—100, 363—393, and *Öhler*, ib. [1861], iv. 204—211). An edition corresponding to modern scientific needs and conditions was undertaken by *A. Reifferscheid*, and continued after his death (1887) by *G. Wis-*

[1] De virg. vel., c. 1.

*sowa:* Pars I, Vienna, 1890 (Corpus scriptorum eccl. Lat., xx.). Cf. *W. von Hartel,* Patristische Studien, Wien, 1890, i.—iv. (reprint from the just-mentioned Wiener Sitzungsberichten, cxx.—cxxi.). For other contributions to the textual criticism of Tertullian cf. *M. Klussmann,* Curarum Tertullianearum partic. i.—iii., Halle, 1881, Gotha, 1887; Excerpta Tertullianea in Isidori Hispalensis Etymologiis (Progr.), Hamburg, 1892. *J. van der Vliet,* Studia ecclesiastica: Tertullianus. I. Critica et interpretatoria, Leiden, 1891. *Aem. Kroymann,* Quaestiones Tertullianeae criticae, Innsbruck, 1894; *H. Gomperz,* Tertullianea, Vienna, 1895; *Kroymann,* Kritische Vorarbeiten für den dritten und vierten Band der neuen Tertullian-Ausgabe, Vienna, 1900 (Sitzungsberichte, clxiii.). — *Fr. A. von Besnard,* Tertullian. Sämtliche Schriften übersetzt und bearbeitet, 2 voll., Augsburg, 1837—1838. *H. Kellner,* Tertullians ausgewählte Schriften übersetzt, 2 voll., Kempten 1870—1871 (Bibl. der Kirchenväter). *Id.,* Tertullians sämtliche Schriften aus dem Lateinischen übersetzt, 2 voll., Cologne, 1882. — For an English translation of the writings of Tertullian see *Holmes* and *Thidnall,* in Ante-Nicene Fathers (ed. Coxe), iii. 17—697, 707—717; iv. 3—121.

On the style and diction of Tertullian the reader may consult *G. R. Hauschild,* Die Grundsätze und Mittel der Wortbildung bei Tertullian (Progr.), I, Leipzig, 1876; II, Frankfurt, 1881. *J. P Condamin,* De Q. S. Fl. Tertulliano vexatae religionis patrono et praecipuo, apud Latinos, christianae linguae artifice (Thèse), Bar-le-duc, 1877. *H. Hoppe,* De sermone Tertullianeo quaestiones selectae (Dissert. inaug.), Marburg, 1897 *E. Norden,* Die antike Kunstprosa, Leipzig, 1898, ii. 606—615. *H. Hoppe,* Syntax und Stil des Tertullian, Leipzig, 1903. See also for the illustration of the text *C. Cavedoni,* Luoghi notevoli di Tertulliano dichiarati coi riscontri dei monumenti antichi, in Archivio dell' Ecclesiastico (1864), ii. 409 to 431. *H. Kellner,* Organischer Zusammenhang und Chronologie der Schriften Tertullians, in «Katholik» (1879), ii. 561—589; *Id.,* Chronologiae Tertullianeae supplementa (Progr.), Bonn, 1890. *G. N. Bonwetsch,* Die Schriften Tertullians nach der Zeit ihrer Abfassung untersucht, Bonn, 1878. *A. Harnack,* Zur Chronologie der Schriften Tertullians, in Zeitschr. für Kirchengesch. (1877—1878), ii. 572—583. *E. Nöldechen,* Die Abfassungszeit der Schriften Tertullians, Leipzig, 1888 (see above). *J. Schmidt,* Ein Beitrag zur Chronologie der Schriften Tertullians und der Prokonsuln von Afrika, in Rhein. Museum für Philol., new series (1891), xlvi. 77—98. *J. P. Knaake,* Die Predigten des Tertullian und Cyprian, in Theol. Studien und Kritiken (1903), lxxvi. 606—639. — Works on the doctrine of Tertullian. *J. A. W Neander,* Antignostikus. Geist des Tertullianus und Einleitung in dessen Schriften, Berlin, 1825; 2. ed. 1849. *C. L. Leimbach,* Beiträge zur Abendmahlslehre Tertullians, Gotha, 1874. *G. Caucanas,* Tertullien et le montanisme, Genève, 1876. *G. R. Hauschild,* Die rationale Psychologie und Erkenntnistheorie Tertullians, Leipzig, 1880. *G. Ludwig,* Tertullians Ethik in durchaus objektiver Darstellung (Inaug. Diss.), Leipzig, 1885. *G. Esser,* Die Seelenlehre Tertullians, Paderborn, 1893. *K. H. Wirth,* Der «Verdienst»-Begriff in der christl. Kirche. I: Der «Verdienst»-Begriff bei Tertullian, Leipzig, 1893. *J. Stier,* Die Gottes- und Logoslehre Tertullians, Göttingen, 1889. *G. Schwelowsky,* Der Apologet Tertullian in seinem Verhältnis zu der griechisch-römischen Philosophie, Leipzig, 1901. *C. Guignebert,* Tertullien. Étude sur ses sentiments à l'égard de l'empire et de la société civile, Paris, 1901. — *J. F. Bethune-Baker,* Tertullian's use of Substantia, Natura, and Persona, in Journal of Theol. Studies (1902—1903), iv. 440—442. *J. Leblanc,* Le matérialisme de Tertullien, in Annales de philos. chrétienne, Juillet, 1903, pp. 415—423. *H. Rönsch,* Das Neue Testament Tertullians aus dessen Schriften mög-

lichst vollständig rekonstruiert, Leipzig, 1871. *J. Kolberg*, Verfassung, Kultus und Disziplin der christlichen Kirche nach den Schriften Tertullians, Braunsberg, 1886. *A. Harnack*, Tertullian in der Literatur der alten Kirche (Sitzungsberichte der kgl. preußischen Akad. der Wissensch. zu Berlin, 1895, pp. 545—579). *A. J. Mason*, Tertullian and Purgatory, in Journal of Theol. Studies (1902), iii. 598—601. *J. Tixeront*, Histoire des dogmes. I: La Théologie ante-Nicéenne, Paris, 1904. *A. d'Alès*, La Théologie de Tertullien, Paris, 1905. *J. Turmel*, Tertullien, in La Pensée chrétienne, Textes et études, Paris, 1905, xlviii. 398.

3. APOLOGETIC WRITINGS. — Foremost among these is the *Apologeticum* or *Apologeticus* (the most ancient text-witnesses do not agree), a defence of Christianity, composed in the summer or autumn of 197, and addressed to the provincial governors of the Roman Empire. It opens with a request, couched in words of great beauty and force, that the truth, being forbidden to defend itself publicly, may reach the ears of the rulers at least by the hidden paths of dumb letters. The Apology itself falls into two parts, in so far as it treats first of the «secret» and then of the «public» crimes of the Christians (*occulta facinora*, c. 6, *manifestiora*, cc. 6 9). He makes short work of the first class of accusations: infanticide, Thyestæan banquets, incest (cc. 7—9); all the more lengthy and detailed is his treatment (cc. 10—27 28—45) of the «public» crimes: contempt of the religion of the fatherland (intentatio laesae divinitatis, c. 27), and the still more reprehensible crime of high treason (titulus laesae augustioris maiestatis, c. 28). He closes with an assertion of the absolute superiority of Christianity; it is a revealed religion and is beyond the rivalry of all human philosophy (cc. 46—50). The special characteristic of the work lies in the boldness with which the politico-juridical accusations against the Christians are brought to the front. Its relations to the *Octavius* of Minucius Felix have already been indicated (§ 24, 2). An ancient Greek version has perished; we know of it only through citations in Eusebius[1]. A second Apology, *Ad nationes libri* ii, is partly illegible in the only manuscript known to us, the *Codex Agobardinus*. In the first book he demonstrates that the accusations launched against the Christians are really true of the heathens; in the second book he draws on Varro's *Rerum divinarum libri* xvi in order to cover with ridicule the heathen belief in the gods. The tone of this work is more animated and acrimonious, than that of the *Apologeticum*. Its process of reasoning is also less orderly and the diction less chaste. It was also written in 197, a little while before the *Apologeticum*, the appearance of which it frequently announces (i. 3 7 10; al.). The golden booklet *De testimonio animae* is an appendix to the *Apologeticum*, destined to illustrate the meaning of the phrase *testimonium animae naturaliter christianae* (Apol. c. 17). Even the heathen, by his in-

[1] Hist. eccl., ii. 2, 4—6; al.

voluntary exclamations and his ordinary modes of speech, gives expression to a natural religious knowledge of God, to belief in His existence and unity, the reality of malevolent spirits, and a life beyond the grave. All this corresponds admirably with the teachings of the Christians. In his treatment of these ideas Tertullian reveals the touch and temper of the poet. The brief letter *Ad Scapulam,* written probably some time after Aug. 14., 212, was intended as an admonition to Scapula, proconsul of Africa, an especially fierce persecutor of the Christians. Tertullian reminds him of the divine judgments that had fallen upon the persecutors of former days. The *Adversus Iudaeos,* called forth, as the opening words show, by a discussion between a Christian and a Jewish proselyte, was written to prove that the grace of God, voluntarily rejected by Israel, has been offered to the Gentiles. In place of the ancient law of retribution there has come the new law of love. In Jesus of Nazareth the prophecies of the Old Testament were fulfilled. The last chapters, 9—14, which deal with the Messianic office of Jesus, are clearly an unskilful excerpt from the third book of Tertullian's «Against Marcion». Some passages, nevertheless, not found in the latter work seem to indicate by their style and vocabulary the personality of Tertullian. It is probably true that Tertullian left the work incomplete; a later and unskilful hand has compiled the last chapters. Chapters 1—8 are surely the work of Tertullian; both internal evidence and citations by St. Jerome make it certain[1].

The best of the separate editions of the Apologeticum is that of *S. Haverkamp*, Leyden, 1718. Later editions or reprints are those by *J. Kayser,* Paderborn, 1865; *H. Hurter,* Innsbruck, 1872 (Ss. Patr. opusc. sel., xix); *F Léonard,* Namur, 1881; *T H. Bindley,* London, 1889. *Vizzini,* Bibliotheca Ss. Patrum, Rome, 1902—1903, series iii, voll. i ii iii iv v, has edited the Apologeticum (according to Havercamp's text), De praescriptione haereticorum, De testimonio animae, De baptismo, De poenitentia, De oratione, De pudicitia, Adversus Marcionem, Adversus Valentinianos. *P. de Lagarde* published a new recension of the *Apologeticum,* in Abhandlungen der k. Gesellsch. d. Wissensch. zu Göttingen, 1891, xxxvii. 73 ff. *C. Callevaert,* Le codex Fuldensis, le meilleur manuscrit de l'Apologeticum de Tertullien, in Revue d'hist. et de litér. religieuses (1902), vii. 322—353. For the ancient Greek version see *Harnack,* in Texte und Untersuchungen (1892), viii. 4, 1—36. The relation between the *Apologeticum* and the *Ad nationes* is treated by *v. Hartel,* Patristische Studien, ii. The letter *Ad Scapulam,* with the *De praescriptione* and the *Ad martyres,* were edited anew by *T. H. Bindley,* Oxford, 1894. For the *Adversus Iudaeos* see *P. Corssen,* Die Altercatio Simonis Iudaei et Theophili Christiani, Berlin, 1890, pp. 2—9; *E. Nöldechen,* in Texte und Untersuchungen, (1894), xii. 2; *J. M. Einsiedler,* De Tertulliani adv. Iudaeos libro (Dissert. Inaug.), Vienna, 1897. *Nöldechen* maintains the genuineness and unity of the work; *Einsiedler,* on the contrary, holds that with a few exceptions the second part is owing to a later compiler.

[1] Comm. in Dan. ad ix. 24 ff.

4. DOGMATICO-POLEMICAL WORKS. — Apart from its local and immediate purpose, the defence of Catholic doctrine in general, or the refutation of heresy as such, was the theme of Tertullian in his imperishable work *De praescriptione haereticorum,* a title vouched for by the oldest and best manuscripts. *Praescriptio* is a form of defence in civil procedure based on length of possession; its result is to exclude the accuser at the very opening of the process. It is admitted by all that the Lord confided to the Apostles the preaching of His doctrine; therefore only the churches founded by them, and not heretics, can be admitted to testify in regard to Christian truth. This is a consequence of the *principalitas veritatis et posteritas mendacitatis* (c. 31). Catholic doctrine is that which existed from the beginning, and is therefore the true one; every heresy is an innovation and as such necessarily false. The appeal of heretics to the Holy Scriptures is clearly unjustifiable, for they are the property of the Catholic Church, which received them from the Apostles. Previous to his discussion and demonstration of the thesis of prescription by possession (cc. 15—40), Tertullian treats at some length of the origin and nature of heresy (cc. 1—14); in conclusion he calls attention to the lack of moral gravity and of religious earnestness visible among heretics; they manifest themselves thereby as followers of falsehood (cc. 41—44). This work stands as a classic defence of the Catholic principle of authority and tradition. It is a development of the theory of St. Irenæus[1], set forth with the skill of a jurist. Tertullian wrote it while still a Catholic, probably before any of his writings against individual heretics (cf. c. 44).

Among the latter works the *Adversus Marcionem libri* v is easily pre-eminent; he revised it twice before it reached its present form (i. 1). The first book in its third (and surviving) form was edited in 207, «in the fifteenth year of the emperor Severus» (i. 15); it is not possible to determine more closely at what intervals the other four books followed. In the first two he refutes Marcion's doctrine of a good God and a Creator-God, the latter at once just and wicked. There cannot be a good God other than the Creator of the world (book i); the Creator is rather the one true God, to whom belong all the attributes with which the Marcionites clothe their good God (book ii). In the third book he proves that the historical Christ is the Messias foretold in the Old Testament. The two remaining books are a critique of the New Testament according to Marcion; in the fourth he discusses the «evangelium», in the fifth the «apostolicum» (§ 25, 7). *Adversus Hermogenem* was probably written after *De praescriptione;* in it he attacks with philosophical and scriptural weapons the dualism of the Gnostics. It was called forth by the teaching of

[1] Adv. haer., iii.; cf. § 34, 3.

the painter Hermogenes (at Carthage?) that God had not created the world. He only fashioned it out of matter that had existed from all eternity. Hermogenes claimed also for his teaching the authority of Scripture. Tertullian is already a Montanist in the *Adversus Valentinianos* (c. 5). Its composition is posterior (c. 16) to that of the work against Hermogenes; in it he is content to describe the doctrine of his adversaries according to St. Irenæus[1] and to cover them with ridicule. We do not know that he ever published the scientific criticism of the Valentinian Gnosis promised in this work (cc. 3 6). He composed the *De baptismo* while still a Catholic, in order to solve the doubts raised among the Christians of Carthage by the rationalistic objections that a certain Quintilla (the proper reading, c. 1) was urging against the ecclesiastical teaching concerning baptism. He declared all heretical baptism invalid (c. 15). The *Scorpiace,* or antidote against the bites of the scorpion, is a booklet against the Gnostics whom he compares to scorpions. Its purpose is to show the moral worth and meritorious nature of martyrdom; it was very probably published after the second book against Marcion (c. 5). The *De carne Christi* is a polemical work against the Gnostic Docetism of Marcion, Apelles, Valentinus, and Alexander; he proves that the body of Christ was a real human body, taken from the virginal body of Mary, but not by the way of human procreation. It is here that we meet (c. 9) his eccentric notion, otherwise in keeping with his extreme realism, that the appearance of Christ was unseemly. He cites in this work among other Christian sources his own fourth book against Marcion (c. 7). The large work *De resurrectione carnis,* also against the Gnostics, seems (c. 2) to have been published immediately after the *De carne Christi.* It reviews (cc. 3—17) the arguments furnished by reason in favor of the resurrection of the body, illustrates at length the pertinent texts of the Old and New Testaments (cc. 18—55), and discusses the nature and qualities of the risen body (cc. 56—63). In the closing chapters he lays especial stress on the substantial identity of the risen with the actual body. *Adversus Praxeam,* probably the last of his anti-heretical writings, certainly written long after his definitive exit from the Church, defends the ecclesiastical teaching concerning the Trinity against Patripassian monarchianism. In his defence of the personal distinction between the Father and the Son he does not, apparently, avoid a certain subordinationism. Nevertheless in many very clear expressions and turns of thought he almost forestalls the Nicene creed.

New editions, or reprints of old editions, of the *De praescriptione* have been made by *H. Hurter,* Innsbruck, 1870 1880 (SS. Patr. opusc. sel. ix): *E. Preuschen,* Freiburg, 1892 (Sammlung ausgewählter kirchen- und dogmengeschichtl. Quellenschriften, iii); *T H. Bindley,* Oxford, 1894. *Tizzini's*

[1] Adv. haer., i.

edition is mentioned on p. 183. *L. Lehanneur*, Le traité de Tertullien contre les Valentiniens, Caen, 1886. De baptismo is also in *Hurter*, l. c., Innsbruck, 1869, vii. *R. A. Lipsius*, Über Tertullians Schrift wider Praxeas, in Jahrb. für deutsche Theol. (1868), xiii. 701—724. — *Th. Schermann*, Lateinische Parallelen zu Didimus (in De baptismo), in Röm. Quartalschr. für christl. Altertumskunde und für Kirchengesch. (1902), xvi. 232—242. *E. Heintzel*, Hermogenes, der Hauptvertreter des philosophischen Dualismus in der alten Kirche, Berlin, 1902. *E. von der Goltz*, Die Traktate des Tertullian und Cyprian über das Gebet, in «Das Gebet in der ältesten Christenheit», Leipzig, 1901, pp. 279—287.

5. PRACTICO-ASCETICAL WRITINGS. — The spirited treatise *De patientia* especially interests all readers of Tertullian, because in a sense addressed to its own impatient author. He was to find a certain consolation in speaking of the beauty and sublimity of patience, even as the sick delight in speaking of the value of health (c. 1). The book surely belongs to the Catholic period of his life, as does also *De oratione* destined for the Catechumens. In the latter he undertakes to explain the Lord's Prayer (cc. 2—9), gives various instructions on the value of prayer in general (cc. 10—28) and ends with a moving description of its power and efficacy (c. 29). In *De paenitentia* he treats of penance at length, of the penitential temper, the practice of penance, and of two kinds of penance peculiar to the early Church: that which an adult was expected to perform before baptism (cc. 4—6) and the so-called canonical penance that the baptised Christian had to undergo after the commission of such grave sins as homicide, idolatry and sins of the flesh, before being reconciled with the Church (cc. 7—12). In his Montanist work *De pudicitia* he directly contradicts the teaching of this Catholic work on penance. His change of attitude was occasioned by the decree of Pope Callixtus (217—222) that henceforth sins of adultery and fornication would be remitted those who had fulfilled the canonical penance (c. 1). In this work Tertullian laments with bitterness the decadence of virtue and righteousness, attacks violently the «psychici», a name given to the Catholics in opposition to the «pneumatici» or Montanists, and undertakes to show that the Church cannot remit such grave sins as adultery and fornication (c. 4). The beautiful letter *Ad martyres*, written certainly (c. 6) in 197, contains words of consolation and exhortation to a number of Christians who had been suffering a long imprisonment for their faith, and were in daily expectation of the final summons. Among his writings are several on Christian marriage, especially on second marriages. The earliest and most attractive is his work *Ad uxorem* in two books. In it he advises his wife Esther not to remarry after his death, or else to marry no one but a Christian. As a Montanist, however, he rejects second marriage unconditionally. In the tractate *De exhortatione castitatis* addressed to a widowed friend, he declares that a second marriage is simply fornication (non

aliud dicendum erit secundum matrimonium quam species stupri, c. 9). In *De monogamia,* written somewhat later, about 217, he maintains the same opinion with even less reserve (*unum matrimonium novimus sicut unum Deum,* c. 1). The *De spectaculis* is devoted to an exhaustive study of a question that had then become very serious: Can Christians frequent the public games and theatres *(spectacula)* of the heathens? His answer is that all such plays are intimately correlated with the idolatrous worship of the times (cc. 4—13) and necessarily constitute an immediate peril for Christian morality by reason of the savage passions they arouse (cc. 14—30). He pours out against heathenism all the hatred of his soul in a flaming description of the greatest spectacle the world shall ever behold, the Second Coming of the Lord or the Last Judgment (c. 30). In *De idololatria,* posterior (c. 13) to *De spectaculis,* and written very probably while he was still a Catholic, he illustrates in every sense the duty of Christians to avoid idolatry; the fine arts and public life are entirely permeated with it and cannot therefore offer any opening for Christian activity. Quite similar are the contents of *De corona,* written probably during August or September of 211, apropos of the act of a Christian soldier who had refused to put on a crown of flowers, in keeping with a heathen custom. As the wearing of such a crown was among the specific rites of idolatry (c. 7) it followed that a Christian soldier could not, on principle, accept military service (c. 11). In the two books *De cultu feminarum,* written while he was still a Catholic, he thunders against female vanity in the matter of dress and ornament. It is only in the *Codex Agobardinus* that the first book bears the title *De cultu feminarum;* in all other manuscripts it is known as *De habitu muliebri;* moreover, it has reached us in a very imperfect state. The second book pursues the same theme, and is composed in a calmer and milder spirit. In the *De oratione* (cc. 21 22) he had maintained that Christian virgins should always be veiled in the Church. Some dissented from his views, and he returned to the subject in a special treatise, *De virginibus velandis,* in which he appealed to the Paraclete, the Holy Scriptures and the discipline of the Church, and went beyond his former demand by insisting that these virgins, once they had reached the age of maturity, should be always and everywhere veiled. *De fuga in persecutione* is a Montanist work, written towards the close of 212, it forbids as absolutely illicit flight of any kind during the stress of persecution. *De ieiunio adversus psychicos* is one of the most offensive of his Montanist writings; in it he denounces (c. 1) the Catholics as gluttons because they observe a certain moderation in fasting.

De patientia is printed in *Hurter,* SS. Patr. opusc. selecta, iv; also ib.) De oratione, ii; De paenitentia, v. De paenitentia and De pudicitia

were edited apart by *E. Preuschen,* Freiburg, 1891 (Sammlung ausgewählter Quellenschriften, ii), and by *P. de Labriolle,* with a French translation (Coll. Hemmer et Lejay), Paris, 1906, lxvii. 237. Cf. *Preuschen,* Tertullians Schriften De paenitentia und De pudicitia mit Rücksicht auf die Bußdisziplin untersucht (Inaug.-Diss.), Tübingen, 1890; also *E. Rolffs,* Das Indulgenzedikt des römischen Bischofs Kallist, Leipzig, 1893 (Texte und Untersuchungen, xi. 3). *G. Esser,* De pudic. c. 21 und der Primat des röm. Bischofs, in «Katholik» (1903), 3, 193—220. — Ad martyres is found in *Hurter,* l. c., iv; there is also an edition by *T H. Bindley,* Oxford, 1894. — On the De monogamia see *Rolffs,* in Texte und Untersuchungen (1895), xii. 4, 50—109: «Tertullians Gegner in De monogamia»; cf. § 35, 5. *E. Klussmann* has published an excellent separate edition of De spectaculis, Leipzig, 1876. See his Adnot. crit. ad *Tert.* libr. de spectac., Rudolstadt, 1876. For the purpose and the sources of the De spectaculis cf. *E. Nöldechen,* in Zeitschr. für wissenschaftl. Theol. (1894), xxxvii. 91—125; Neue Jahrb. für deutsche Theol. (1894), iii. 206—226; Zeitschr. für Kirchengesch. (1894—1895), xv. 161—203; *Philologus,* Suppl. (1894), vi. 2, 727 to 766. *K. Werber,* Tertullians Schrift De spectac. in ihrem Verhältnis zu Varros Rerum divinarum libri (Progr.), Teschen, 1896. On the De ieiunio see *Rolffs,* l. c. (1895), xii. 4, 5—49: «Tertullians Gegner in De ieiunio».

6. THE «DE ANIMA» AND «DE PALLIO» — Two works of Tertullian do not fall into any of the above-mentioned groups; they merit therefore a distinct mention. *De anima* belongs to his Montanist period (cc. 9 45 58) and was written after the second book against Marcion (c. 21). It is the first Christian psychology, though less a manual of philosophy than of theology, its purpose being (c. 1—3) to describe the doctrine of the soul according to Christian revelation and to refute the philosophic or rather Gnostic heresy that hid itself beneath the cloak of philosophy. The first section (cc. 4—22) deals with the nature and the faculties of the soul. While he does not deny the immaterial character of the latter, he believes himself bound to maintain a certain degree of corporeity; for a condition of pure spirituality was unintelligible to him[1]. In the second section (cc. 23 to 41) he investigates the problem of the specific origin of each soul, rejects the theories of pre-existence and of metempsychosis, and opposes to creatianism the crassest generatianism or traducianism. In the act of generation man reproduces his whole nature, body and soul. The third section (cc. 42—58) treats of death, sleep, the world of dreams, the state and place of the soul after death. The curious little work *De pallio,* written between 209 and 211 (cf. c. 2), owes its origin to a personal circumstance. For some unknown reason Tertullian had put off the toga and taken to wearing the pallium, an act that drew down on him the satire of his fellow-citizens. In this booklet he justifies his conduct with playful art and biting sarcasm.

Concerning the source of De anima, a work on the same subject (De an. c. 6) by *Soranus*, a physician of Ephesus, see *H. Diels,* Doxo-

[1] De carne Christi, c. 11; Adv. Praxeam, c. 7.

graphi Graeci, Berlin, 1890, pp. 203 ff. We owe to *Cl. Salmasius* an excellent separate edition of the De pallio, Paris, 1622, Leyden, 1656. This latter treatise is illustrated by *H. Kellner*, in Theol. Quartalschr. (1870), lii. 547—566, and by *G. Boissier*, La fin du paganisme, Paris, 1891 (3. ed., Paris, 1898), i. 259—304.

7. LOST WRITINGS OF TERTULLIAN. — Three of his extant Latin works, he tells us, were written also in Greek: *De spectaculis*[1], *De baptismo* or on the invalidity of heretical baptism (c. 15), *De virginibus velandis* (c. 1). The Greek text of these writings has perished; and similarly the Latin text of a still larger number of writings. We know from his own statement that he published works entitled *De spe fidelium, De paradiso, Adversus Apelleiacos* (?), *De censu animae adversus Hermogenum, De fato De spe fidelium*[2] promoted Chiliastic views[3]. In *De paradiso*[4] he discussed many questions concerning Paradise[5]; among other things he maintained the thesis that all departed souls, except those of the martyrs, must wait in the under-world «until the day of the Lord»[6]. *Adversus Apelleiacos* was directed against the followers of Apelles (§ 25, 7) who held that not God, but a superior angel had created this world and was afterwards seized with regret for his act[7]. In *De censu animae*[8], «on the origin of the soul», he refuted the doctrine of Hermogenes that the soul was material in its origin, and there was in man no such thing as free will[9]. *De fato* was written against the teachings of the philosophers concerning fate and chance[10]. Through St. Jerome we know of three (or rather, perhaps, five) other works of Tertullian. One of them was entitled *De ecstasi,* or rather *περὶ ἐκστάσεως*[11], perhaps a Greek work in defence of Montanism or the ecstatic speech of the Montanist prophets. It was originally in six books, but when he had read the anti-Montanistic work of Apollonius (§ 35, 3) he added a seventh book against the latter. A work on marriage, *Ad amicum philosophum de angustiis nuptiarum,* is mentioned twice by St. Jerome[12]. Another lost work was entitled *De Aaron vestibus,* on the liturgical garments of the High Priest in the Old Testament[13]. It is supposed that he wrote two other works: *De circumcisione* and *De mundis atque immundis animalibus*[14]. The index of the Codex Agobardinus shows that it once contained three works of Tertullian entitled: *De carne et anima, De animae submissione, De superstitione saeculi;* nothing is known of them beyond these titles.

[1] *Tert.*, De corona, c. 6. [2] Adv. Marcion., iii. 24.
[3] *Hier.*, De viris ill., c. 18; Comm. in Ezech. ad xxxvi. 1 ss.
[4] *Tert.*, De anima, c. 55. [5] *Id.*, Adv. Marc, v. 12.
[6] *Id.*, De anima, c. 55. [7] *Id.*, De carne Christi, c. 8.
[8] *Id.*, De anima, c 1. [9] Ib., cc. 1 3 11 21 22 24.
[10] Ib., c. 20; see the citation in Planciades Fulgentius: *Tertull.* opp. (ed. *Öhler*), ii. 745.
[11] *Hier.*, De viris ill., c. 53; cf. c. 40 and also c. 24. [12] *Hier.*, Ep. 22, 22.
[13] *Hier.*, Ep. 64, 23. [14] *Id.*, Ep. 36, 1.

8. SPURIOUS WRITINGS. — In the manuscripts and editions there is commonly added to *De praescriptione,* as an appendix, a *Libellus adversus omnes haereses,* containing a list of heretics from Dositheus to Praxeas. The work is surely not from Tertullian's pen, but rather from that of Victorinus of Pettau (§ 58, 1). The principal source used by its author was the so-called Syntagma of Hippolytus (§ 54, 3). The works *De Trinitate* and *De cibis Judaicis,* published in the editions of Tertullian, were written by Novatian (§ 55, 2 3). A fragment *De execrandis gentium diis,* proving from the example of Jupiter that the heathens entertain unworthy notions of the divinity, is of unknown origin; the diversity of style shows that it cannot belong to Tertullian. Neither is he the author of the poem *Adversus Marcionem* or *Adversus Marcionitas* in 1302 hexameters and five books. It is not only devoid of poetical merit, but frequently violates the rules of grammar and prosody. Hückstädt and Oxé agree in attributing it to the latter half of the fourth century, the former to a writer in Rome, the latter to one in Africa, while Waitz maintains that it was composed by Commodianus (§ 57).

For the Libellus adversus omnes haereses (*Oehler,* l. c., ii. 751—765) see the literature on the Syntagma of Hippolytus (§ 54, 3). *E. Hückstädt,* Über das pseudo-tertullianische Gedicht Adv. Marcionem (Inaug. Diss.), Leipzig, 1875. *A. Oxé,* Prolegomena de carmine Adv. Marcionitas (Dissert. inaug.), Leipzig, 1888; also *Oxé,* Victorini versus de lege Domini, ein unedierter Cento aus dem Carmen Adv. Marcionitas (Progr.), Krefeld, 1894. *H. Waitz,* Das pseudo-tertullianische Gedicht Adv. Marcionem, Darmstadt, 1901. For the poems *De genesi* cf. *Oehler,* l. c., ii. 774—776 (§ 88, 2), *De Sodoma* and *De Iona* ib., ii. 769—773 (§ 88, 2). See § 116, 5 for the poem *De iudicio Domini* (*Oehler,* l. c., ii. 776—781), also found amidst the works of Cyprian (ed. *Hartel,* iii. 308—325) where it is entitled *Ad Flavium Felicem de resurrectione mortuorum.*

### § 51. St. Cyprian.

1. HIS LIFE. — One of the most attractive figures in early ecclesiastical literature is the noble bishop of Carthage, Thascius Cæcilius Cyprianus. The *Vita Caecilii Cypriani,* which describes his conversion to the Christian faith, was written soon after his death by one closely related to him and thoroughly informed[1] according to St Jerome by his deacon and companion Pontius. From his own writings, however, especially from his correspondence, we acquire a better knowledge of his life both private and public. He was born about the year 200 in Africa, of wealthy heathen parents, embraced the career of a rhetorician and as such won brilliant renown at Carthage[2]. About 246 he was converted to Christianity by Cæcilianus (*Vita* c. 4) or Cæcilius[3], a priest of Carthage, soon after

[1] *Hier.,* De viris ill., c. 68. [2] *Lact.,* Div. Inst., v. 1, 24.
[3] *Hier.,* De viris ill., c. 67.

which he was admitted among the clergy At the end of 248 or early in 249, he was made bishop of Carthage and metropolitan of proconsular Africa. He discharged the duties of this office during ten stormy years with indefatigable zeal and great success. In the sanguinary persecution of Decius (250—251), during which he fled from Carthage and kept himself in concealment, many renounced the Christian faith and were known as *sacrificati* or *thurificati, libellatici, acta facientes*. The question regarding the treatment of these *lapsi* or rather the conditions of their reconciliation with the Church led to a schism at Carthage as well as at Rome. The deacon Felicissimus became the leader of a party which reproached Cyprian with his great severity, while at Rome a part of the community ranged itself under the banner of Novatian and withdrew from communion with Pope Cornelius because of his excessive mildness in the treatment of similar «fallen» brethren. The controversy on the validity of heretical baptism was the occasion of other grave disorders. Cyprian held with Tertullian (§ 50, 4 7) that baptism administered by heretics was invalid; he therefore baptized anew all who returned from an heretical body to the communion of the Church. In this he was sustained by several councils that met at Carthage under his presidency in 255, in the spring of 256, and Sept. 1., 256. But Pope Stephen I. rejected their views and declared: *Si qui ergo a quacumque haeresi venient ad vos, nihil innovetur nisi quod traditum est, ut manus illis imponatur in paenitentiam*[1] The ensuing persecution of Valerian and the death of the Pope prevented a formal conflict between Stephen and Cyprian. The latter was beheaded, September 14., 258, in the gardens of the proconsular Villa Sexti, not far from Carthage; the *Acta proconsularia*, or official record of his execution, are still extant.

The *Vita Caecilii Cypriani* and *Acta proconsularia* are usually published with the works of Cyprian (ed. *Hartel*, iii [1871]. xc—cxiv). — *C. Suyskenus*, De S. Cypriano, in Acta SS. Sept., Venice, 1761, iv. 191—348. *Fr. W. Rettberg*, Thascius Caecilius Cyprianus, Göttingen, 1831. *Fr. Böhringer*, Die Kirche Christi und ihre Zeugen, 2. ed., iii—iv. Die lateinisch-afrikanische Kirche: Tertullianus, Cyprianus, Stuttgart, 1864, reprinted 1873. *C. E. Freppel*, St. Cyprien, Paris, 1865; 3. ed. 1890. *J. Peters*, Der hl. Cyprian von Karthago, Ratisbon, 1877. *B. Fechtrup*, Der hl. Cyprian, I, Münster, 1878. *E. Wh. Benson*, Cyprian, London, 1897. *P. Monceaux*, Histoire littéraire de l'Afrique chrétienne. II: St. Cyprien et son temps, Paris, 1902. Cf. *H. Grisar*, Cyprians «Oppositions-Konzil» gegen Papst Stephan, in Zeitschr. für kathol. Theol. (1881), V 193—221 (He holds that the decision of Stephen was issued not before, but after the council of September i. 256). — *J. Ernst*, War der hl. Cyprian exkommuniziert? Ib., 1894, xviii. 473—499 (he was not). *Id.*, Der angebliche Widerruf des hl. Cyprian in der Ketzertauffrage, ib., 1895, xix. 234—272. *F. Kemper*, De vitarum Cypriani, Martini Turonensis, Ambrosii, Augustini rationibus (Dissert.), Münster, 1904.

[1] *Cypr.*, Ep. 74, 1 (ed. *Hartel*).

2. HIS WRITINGS. — The writings of Cyprian, collected at a very early date, were read with diligence and zealously multiplied. Pontius himself possessed a collection of the treatises of Cyprian and has left us a rhetorical paraphrase of their titles or themes (*Vita* c. 7). It is both interesting and suggestive to note that in an ancient and anonymous Catalogue of the *Libri Canonici* of the Old and New Testaments (derived from a copy of the same made in 359) the writings of Cyprian, both treatises and letters, are also indicated, with the number of lines contained in each *(cum indiculis versuum)*. St. Jerome felt that he was not bound to furnish a catalogue of the writings of Cyprian: *Huius ingenii superfluum est indicem texere, cum sole clariora sint eius opera*[1] These works are still extant in almost countless manuscripts, some of which reach back to the sixth century. So far as we know, only a few of his letters have been lost.

His writings fall spontaneously into two groups: treatises *(sermones, libelli, tractatus)* and letters. The voice that resounds in both groups is that of a bishop and a shepherd of souls. He is a man of practice and not of theory, a man of faith and not of speculation. When he takes up the pen, it is in behalf of practical aims and interests; thus, where oral discourse is insufficient, he hastens to succour the good cause with his writings. He does not go far afield in theoretical discussion, but appeals to the Christian and ecclesiastical sentiments of his hearers, and bases his argument on the authority of the Sacred Scriptures. He exhibits on all occasions a spirit of moderation and mildness and a remarkable power of organization. He never loses himself in pursuit of intangible ideals but follows consistently the aims that he has grasped with clearness and decision. St. Augustine outlined his character correctly when he called him a Catholic bishop and a Catholic martyr *(catholicum episcopum, catholicum martyrem)*[2]. The central idea of his life is the unity of the Catholic Church; it has been rightly said that this concept is like the root whence issue all his doctrinal writings. Indeed, he is nowhere so independent and original as in his work *De catholicae ecclesiae unitate*. In his other works he very frequently borrows from Tertullian[3]; we learn from the same source that he read the works of that writer every day It was his wont when calling on his secretary for a book of Tertullian to exclaim: *Da magistrum*[4]. At the same time, whatever the degree of his literary dependency, his own personality is apparent in every one of his writings. The thoughts of Cyprian may be close akin to the thoughts of Tertullian, but the form in which the bishop of Carthage clothes these thoughts differs widely from the style of Tertullian. The diction of Cyprian is free and pleasing, and flows

[1] De viris ill., c. 67. [2] *Aug.*, De bapt., iii. 3, 5.
[3] *Hier.*, Ep. 84, 2. [4] *Hier.*, De viris ill., c. 53.

in a tranquil and clear, almost transparent stream[1]. His language is at all times enlivened and exalted by the warmth of his feelings. Quite frequently the page is colored by images and allegories chosen with taste and finished with skilful attention to the smallest detail; not a few of them became more or less the common places of later ecclesiastical literature.

The Catalogue of the *Libri Canonici* and the works of Cyprian, belonging to the year 359, was first edited by *Th. Mommsen*, in Hermes (1886), xxi. 142—156; cf. (1890), xxv. 636—638. On the same theme see *W. Sanday* and *C. H. Turner*, in Studia biblica et ecclesiastica, Oxford 1891, iii. 217—325. *K. G. Götz*, Geschichte der cyprianischen Literatur bis zu der Zeit der ersten erhaltenen Handschriften (Inaug. Diss.), Basle, 1891. — On the manuscripts of Cyprian cf. *Hartel*, in his own edition (1871), iii. I—LXX; also *Harnack*, Geschichte der altchristl. Literatur, i. 697 to 701. *C. H. Turner*, The original order and contents of our oldest Ms. of St. Cyprian, in Journal of Theol. Studies (1902), iii. 282—285; A newly discovered leaf of a fifth-century manuscript of St. Cyprian, ib., iii. 576—578; Our oldest manuscripts of St. Cyprian: The Turin and Milan Fragment, ib., iii. 579—584. *Dom Ramsay*, Our oldest manuscripts of St. Cyprian, ib., iii. 585—594.

The complete works of Cyprian were first published by *J. Andreas*, Rome, 1471. Then followed the editions of *D. Erasmus*, Basle, 1520; *J. Pamelius*, Antwerp. 1568; *M. Rigaltius*, Paris, 1648; *J. Fell* and *J. Pearson*, Oxford, 1682; *Stephen Baluzius* and *Pr. Maranus*, Paris, 1726. The edition of *Migne* (PL. iii—v) reproduces, very incorrectly, the text of Baluzius and Maranus. The most recent and the best edition of the works of St. Cyprian is that of *W. von Hartel*, Vienna, 1868—1871, in three parts (*Corpus scriptorum* eccl. Lat., iii, pars i—iii). For a criticism of the Hartel edition cf. *P. de Lagarde*, in Göttinger Gelehrten Anzeigen (1871), pp. 521 to 543 (reprinted in *P. de Lagarde*, Symmikta, Göttingen, 1877, pp. 65 to 78). — *G. Mercati*, D'alcuni nuovi sussidii per la critica del testo di S. Cypriano, Rome, 1899. A German version of most of the treatises was published by *U. Uhl*, Kempten, 1869, and all the letters by *J. Niglutsch* and *A. Egger*, ib., 1879 (Bibl. der Kirchenväter). — *Le Provost*, Etude philologique et littéraire sur St. Cyprien, Paris, 1889. *E. W. Watson*, The style and language of St. Cyprian, in Studia bibl. et eccles., Oxford, 1896, iv. 189—324. *L. Bayard*, Le latin de St. Cyprien, Paris, 1902. *E. de Jonghe*, Les clausules de Saint Cyprien, in Musée Belge (1902), vi. 344 to 363.

For the doctrine of St. Cyprian cf. *J. Peters*, Die Lehre des hl. Cyprian von der Einheit der Kirche, Luxemburg, 1870. *J. H. Reinkens*, Die Lehre des hl. Cyprian von der Einheit der Kirche, Würzburg, 1873. *De Leo*, In librum S. Cypr. De unitate ecclesiae disquisitio critico-theologica, Naples, 1877. *O. Ritschl*, Cyprian von Karthago und die Verfassung der Kirche, Göttingen, 1885. *J. de la Rochelle*, L'idee de l'église dans St. Cyprien, in Revue d'histoire et de littérature religieuses (1896), i. 519—533. *P. v. Hoensbroech*, Der römische Primat bezeugt durch den hl. Cyprian, in Zeitschr. für kathol. Theol. (1890), xiv. 193—230; *Id.*, Zur Auffassung Cyprians von der Ketzertaufe, ib. (1891), xv. 727—736. *J. Ernst*, Zur Auffassung Cyprians von der Ketzertaufe, ib. (1893), xvii. 79—103. *K. G. Götz*, Die Bußlehre Cyprians, Königsberg, 1894. *K. Müller*, Die Buß-

[1] *Lact.*, Div. Inst., v. 1, 25; *Hier.*, Ep. 58, 10.

institution in Karthago unter Cyprian, in Zeitschr. für Kirchengesch. (1895 to 1896), xvi. 1—44, 187—219. *K. G. Götz,* Das Christentum Cyprians, Gießen, 1896. *K. H. Wirth,* Der «Verdienst»-Begriff in der christl. Kirche nach seiner geschichtlichen Entwicklung dargestellt; II. Der «Verdienst»-Begriff bei Cyprian, Leipzig, 1901. *A. Melardi,* S. Cypriano di Cartagine contributo all' apologetica latina del 3. secolo, Potenza, 1901. — *P. Corssen,* Der cyprianische Text der Acta apostol. (Progr.), Berlin, 1892. *J. Heidenreich,* Der neutestamentliche Text bei Cyprian verglichen mit dem Vulgatatext, Bamberg, 1900. *A. Harnack,* Cyprian als Enthusiast, in Zeitschr. für die neutestamentl. Wissensch. (1902), iii. 177—191. *P. St. John,* A disputed point in St. Cyprian's attitude towards the Primacy, in American Ecclesiastical Review (1903), xxix. 162—182. *J. P. Knaabe,* Die Predigten des Tertullian und Cyprian, in Theol. Studien und Kritiken (1903), lxxvi. 606—639.

3. TREATISES. — *Pontius* mentions[1] eleven or twelve treatises of Cyprian in the following, perhaps also the chronological, order: a) *Ad Donatum,* an outpouring of his heart addressed to an otherwise unknown friend, for whom he depicts the new life entered on by baptismal regeneration; it was probably composed shortly after his conversion. The poetical form and the style of the treatise betray the former rhetorician[2]. b) *De habitu virginum* (in the Catalogue of 359: *Ad virgines*), a pastoral letter to women, especially to those virgins who had dedicated themselves to the service of the Lord. Cyprian calls them «the blossoms on the tree of the Church» (c. 3). He puts them on their guard particularly against vanity in dress. This treatise resembles very much the *De cultu feminarum* of Tertullian. c) *De lapsis,* composed in the spring of 251, immediately after the persecution of Decius and his own return to Carthage. In it he laments most touchingly the apostasy of so many brethren; their reconciliation must depend on a good confession and the performance of a corresponding penance. d) To the same year belongs the immortal work *De catholicae ecclesiae unitate,* a forcible exposition and defence of the Church, to which alone were made the promises of salvation, and not to the schisms at Rome and Carthage. Christ founded His Church on one, on Peter; the unity of the foundation guarantees that of the edifice. Schism and heresy are the weapons of Satan. That person cannot have God for his Father who has not the Church for his mother (*habere non potest Deum patrem, qui ecclesiam non habet matrem*, c. 6). e) The treatise of Cyprian *De dominica oratione*, written about the beginning of 252, is similar in its contents to Tertullian's *De oratione*, and is important chiefly for its lengthy exposition of the Lord's Prayer (cc. 7—27), a feature that made it much beloved in Christian antiquity[3] f) *Ad Demetrianum,* probably composed early in 252, and markedly apologetic in tendency The sufferings of these unhappy times, war, pestilence and famine, which the heathen to whom he

[1] Vita c. 7. [2] *Aug.*, De doctr. christ., iv. 14, 31.
[3] *Hil.*, Comm. in Matth., v. 1.

writes attributed to the Christian contempt of the gods, are really divine punishments, inflicted on account of the obstinacy and wickedness of the heathens, and in particular of their persecution of the Christians. g) The *De mortalitate* owes its origin to a pestilence that raged at Carthage and in the neighborhood, especially from 252—254. It is such a discourse of consolation as a bishop might deliver, and breathes in every line a magnanimity of soul and a power of faith that are most touching. The fact that the pestilence carried off both the faithful and the unbelievers ought not to surprise the former, since by word and example the Scripture makes known to all Christians that it is their especial destiny to suffer trial and tribulation. Temptation is only the prelude of victory, trial an occasion of merit, and death the transit to a better life. h) The *De opere et eleemosynis,* an exhortation to efficacious charity towards our neighbor, owes its origin, probably, to similar circumstances. Almsgiving is, in a certain sense, a means of obtaining grace; it appeases the divine wrath and atones for our postbaptismal faults and entitles us to a higher degree of eclestial happiness. i) *De bono patientiae* was written during the conflict concerning heretical baptism [1], very probably in the summer of 256 in the hope of calming the irritation and anger of his opponents, and as a pledge of the author's own anxiety for the restoration of peace. It draws largely on the *De patientia* of Tertullian. k) *De zelo et livore* was probably meant to complete the preceding treatise; it is at once the work of a reconciling arbiter and a deciding judge. Envy and jealousy are poisonous growths that often strike deep roots in the soil of the Church, and bring forth the most deplorable fruits: hatred, schism, dissatisfaction, insubordination. l) *Ad Fortunatum* is a collection of passages from Holy Writ put together at the request of the recipient, and likely to confirm the faithful soul in the tempest of persecution, which we assume to be that of Valerian, that had been raging since the middle of 257 Thirteen theses relative to this grievous trial are set forth, each of them is confirmed by quotations from the Bible. m) Pontius appears to have been acquainted with another treatise that encouraged confessors to be brave unto the end; but it has not been possible to identify it with any certainty

*J. G. Krabinger* published excellent editions of the *De catholicae ecclesiae unitate, De lapsis, De habitu virginum,* Tübingen, 1853, also of the other treatises, *Ad Donatum, De dominica oratione, De mortalitate, Ad Demetrianum, De opere et eleemosynis, De bono patientiae, De zelo et livore,* Tübingen, 1859. *H. Hurter,* Ss. Patr. opusc. select., contains in vol. I: *Ad Demetr.* and *De cath. eccl. unit.;* in vol. II: *De dom. orat.*; in vol. IV: *De mortal., De op. et eleem.* and *De bono pat.*, in vol. V *De lapsis.* On the De opere et eleemosynis cf. *E. W Watson,* in Journal of Theol. Studies (1901), ii. 433—438. *K. G. Götz* has tried to show, but without success, in

[1] *Cypr.*, Ep. 73, 26.

Texte und Untersuchungen, xix, new series (1899) iv. 1 c., that the brief letter *Donatus Cypriano* (ed. *Hartel,* iii. 272), hitherto held to be spurious, is really the beginning of the treatise *Ad Donatum. Dom Ramsay,* An Uncial Fragment of the Ad Donatum of St. Cyprian, in Journal of Theol. Studies (1902), iv. 86—89. Concerning De hab. virg. cf. *J. Haussleiter,* in Commentationes Woelfflinianae, Leipzig, 1891, pp. 377—389. *B. Aubé,* L'Eglise et l'Etat dans la seconde moitié du IIIe siècle. Paris, 1885, pp. 305 ff., calls in doubt, without any good reason, the genuineness of *Ad Demetrianum.* In the Revue Bénédictine (1902), xix. 246—254, *J. Chapman* began a study on the well-known interpolations in *De catholicae ecclesiae unitate* in favor of the Roman Church, hitherto never submitted to a close examination; *Id.,* The interpolations in St. Cyprian's De unitate ecclesiae, in Journal of Theol. Studies (1904), v 634—636; cf. *E. W. Watson,* The interpolations in St. Cyprian's De unitate ecclesiae, ib., v. 432—436. — *P. Franchi de' Cavalieri,* Un nuovo libello originale di libellatici della persecuzione deciana, in Miscellanea di storia e cultura eccles. (1904). *L. Chabalier,* Les lapsi dans l'Eglise d'Afrique au temps de Saint Cyprien (Thèse), Lyon, 1904.

4. TREATISES (CONTINUED). — The work *Ad Quirinum* in three books, known formerly as *Testimoniorum libri adversus Judaeos,* contains a demonstration of the rejection of the Jews and the vocation of the Christians (book i), a sketch of Christology (book ii), and an introduction to a Christian and virtuous life (book iii, probably a later addition). At the beginning of each book are several theses, each of which, after the manner of the treatise *Ad Fortunatum,* is in its turn proved by a series of citations from Holy Writ. The first express mention of the work is found in the afore-mentioned Catalogue of the year 359. Before that date several ancient writers (Pseudo-Cyprian *Adversus aleatores,* Commodian, Lactantius, Firmicus Maternus) had already made good use of its Scriptural treasures. The work is certainly authentic. The tractate *Quod idola dii non sint* is largely a compilation from the *Octavius* of Minucius Felix and the *Apologeticum* of Tertullian. It is first mentioned by St. Jerome[1] The authorship of Cyprian is uncertain. Haussleiter maintains, but without success, the authorship of Novatian.

*B. Dombart,* Über die Bedeutung Commodians für die Textkritik der *Testimonia* Cyprians, in Zeitschr. für wissenschaftl. Theol. (1879), xxii. 374 to 389. For the genuineness of the third book *Ad Quirinum* cf. *J. Haussleiter,* in Comment. Woelfflin. (1891), pp. 377 ff. *Dom Ramsay,* On early insertions in the third book of St. Cyprian's *Testimonia,* in Journal of Theol. Studies (1901), ii. 276—288. See also *C. H. Turner,* Prolegomena to the Testimonia of St. Cyprian, ib. (1905), vi. 246—270. Concerning the origin of *Quod idola dii non sint* see *Haussleiter,* in Theol. Literaturblatt (1894), xv. 481—487

5. THE LETTERS OF CYPRIAN. — The collection of the Letters of Cyprian contains, in the latest editions, eighty-one pieces or numbers, sixty-five of which are from his hand; the others are mostly

[1] Ep. 70, 5.

letters addressed to him. By reason of its very copious contents this collected correspondence of Cyprian is a primary source of authoritative information concerning the life and discipline of the primitive Church. All the letters date from the period of his episcopal rule in Carthage (248/249—258). In the Vienna or Hartel edition of 1871, they are numbered according to the Oxford recension of 1682, but later researches render necessary certain modifications in the accepted order of the correspondence. The letters may be divided into the following groups: a) Letters whose dates cannot be ascertained; they are 1—4 and 63 (ed. Hartel); they contain no references to contemporary persons or events, and probably were all composed before the persecution of Decius. Letter 63, entitled in the manuscripts *De sacramento dominici calicis*, is a precious confirmation of the traditional Catholic doctrine concerning the sacrificial character of the Eucharist. b) Letters sent to Carthage in the first period of the Decian persecution (250); they are 5—7 and 10—19, and were addressed from his hiding place to the clergy and the faithful of the city. They contain exhortations to prudence, to perseverance on the part of the confessors, to care of the poor, and also some reproaches and decisions in the matter of the *lapsi* (15—19). c) The correspondence of Cyprian (representing the clergy of Carthage) with the Roman clergy in whose hands lay the government of the Church during the vacancy between the death of Fabian and the succession of Cornelius (Jan. 250 to March 251). In all there are twelve of these letters: 8 9 20 21 22 27 28 30 31 35 36 37. In letter 20 Cyprian justifies his flight and explains his manner of dealing with the *lapsi;* he returns to the same subject in letters 27 and 35. In letters 30 and 36, the Roman clergy, by the hand of Novatian, assure Cyprian that they are in full agreement with him as to the treatment of the *lapsi.* d) Letters sent to Carthage in the last period of the Decian persecution (250—251), they are 23—26 29 32—34 38—43. Of these fourteen letters twelve were written by Cyprian; with the exception of two they were addressed to the clergy and the faithful of Carthage. The last three (41—43) deal with the schism of Felicissimus. e) Letters of the years 251—252, relative to the troubles occasioned by the schism of Novatian, and numbered 44—55. Scarcely had Cyprian been accurately informed of what was occurring at Rome, when he came out with decisive energy in favor of the legitimate pope Cornelius; he could not, however, check the spread of the schism into Africa. Among the twelve letters of the group are six from Cyprian to Cornelius and two replies from the latter (49 50). f) Letters of the years 252—254, numbered 56—62 64—66,; the contents of which are of a miscellaneous nature. Letter 57 was sent by a Synod of Carthage 253 (?) to Pope Cornelius apropos of the *lapsi;* letter 64 was written by a Carthaginian provincial Synod in 252 (?) to

a certain bishop Fidus, and treats mostly of the baptism of children. g) Letters of the years 254—256, numbered 67—75. Letter 67 is a synodical letter in the matter of Basilides and Martial, Spanish bishops, who had been deposed as *lapsi;* while letters 69—75 deal with the validity of heretical baptism. Letter 70 represents the opinions of the Synod of Carthage held in 255, and letter 72 the decision of the spring Synod of 256, both dealing with the subject of heretical baptism. There has also been preserved an extract from the minutes of the Synod of Carthage, September 1. 256, in which the invalidity of heretical baptism was again asserted *(Sententiae episcoporum numero LXXXVII de haereticis baptizandis).* It is usually placed not among the letters, but among the treatises of Cyprian. Letter 74 reveals in all its fulness the difference of opinion between Cyprian and Pope Stephen. Concerning letter 75 cf. § 47, 7 h) Letters written during the persecution of Valerian (257— 258) and numbered 76—81. In letter 76 we have an admirable message of consolation from the exiled bishop to the martyrs in the mines. In letter 81 the shepherd of Carthage, while awaiting a martyr's death, sends to his flock a final salutation.

For the chronology of the Letters of Cyprian see *O. Ritschl,* De epistulis Cyprianicis (Dissert. inaug.), Halle, 1885. *Id.,* Cyprian von Karthago und die Verfassung der Kirche, Göttingen, 1885, pp. 238—250. *P. Monceaux,* Chronologie des œuvres de St. Cyprien et des conciles Africains du temps, in Revue de Philologie (1900), xxxii, also the larger work of Monceaux quoted above (1 of this §). *L. Nelke,* Die Chronologie der Korrespondenz Cyprians und der pseudo-cyprianischen Schriften *Ad Novatianum* und *Liber de rebaptismate* (Dissert.), Thorn, 1902. — For the correspondence of Cyprian and the Roman clergy during the year 250 see *A. Harnack,* in Theol. Abhandlungen, C. v. Weizsäcker gewidmet, Freiburg, 1892, pp. 1—36. Concerning letter 8 see *J. Haussleiter,* Der Aufbau der altchristl. Literatur, Berlin, 1898, pp. 16—33. Letters 8 21 22 and 23 24 are written in popular Latin; they have been edited anew by *A. Miodoński,* Anonymus adv. aleatores, Erlangen and Leipzig, 1889, pp. 112 to 126. On Letter 42 cf. *E. Watson,* Cyprianica, in Journal of Theol. Studies (1902—1903), iv. 131, and *J. Chapman,* The order of the Treatises and Letters in the Mss. of St. Cyprian, ib., iv. 103—123.

The *Sententiae episcoporum* are found in *Hartel,* l. c., i. 433—461. *Nelke,* l. c., locates their composition about 255. The synodal letters 57 64 67 70 72 and the *Sententiae* are also found in *Routh,* Reliquiae sacrae (2) iii. 93—131; for the annotationes see pp. 132—217.

A Greek version of the *Sententiae* was first published (complete) by *P de Lagarde,* Reliquiae iuris eccles. antiquissimae graece, Leipzig, 1856, pp. 37—55. The lost letters of Cyprian are discussed by *Harnack,* Gesch. der altchristl. Litteratur, i. 692. *Id.,* Über verlorene Briefe und Aktenstücke, die sich aus der cyprianischen Briefsammlung ermitteln lassen, in Texte und Untersuchungen, new series, Leipzig, 1902, viii. 2. *Fr. v. Soden,* Die cyprianische Briefsammlung. Geschichte ihrer Entstehung und Überlieferung, ib., new series, Leipzig, 1904, x. 3.

6. SPURIOUS WRITINGS. — The glorious name of Cyprian was soon invoked to cover many an supposititious composition. a) The

*De laude martyrii,* a bombastic sermon in praise of martyrdom, reminding one of Vergil rather than of Holy Writ, must be looked on as spurious, if only because of its style. Nevertheless, it figures among the works of Cyprian in the Catalogue of 359. Harnack's ascription of the authorship to Novatian has been refuted by Weyman. b) *Adversus Judaeos,* also a sermon, which in vigorous rhetorical diction exhorts Israel to enter into itself and do penance; it is likewise quoted as a work of Cyprian in the Catalogue of 359. It was formerly supposed that the Latin text was a translation from the Greek, but it is itself the original. The author must be sought for, with Harnack and Landgraf, among the friends of Novatian; possibly it was written by Novatian himself. c) *De montibus Sina et Sion,* written in popular Latin, contains some obscure remarks on the relations of the Old and New Testaments. Harnack refers it to the first half of the third century. d) *De spectaculis,* against the frequentation of heathen plays and theatres, is based on the homonymous work of Tertullian. The introduction shows that it was written by a bishop living at some distance from his flock. Wölfflin holds it to be a genuine work of Cyprian, Weymann and Demmler maintain that it belongs to Novatian. e) *De bono pudicitiae,* written very probably by the author of *De spectaculis,* is a spirited elogium of chastity. Matzinger failed to establish the authorship of Cyprian, while Weymann and Demmler argue well for the authorship of Novatian. f) *Ad Novatianum,* against his rigoristic views; internal evidence (c. 6) shows that it was written shortly after the persecution of Gallus and Volusian (251—253). Harnack maintains, without sufficient proof, that it is from the pen of Pope Sixtus II. (257—258), however, there is not sufficient evidence to show even that it was written in Rome. g) *De aleatoribus,* rather *Adversus aleatores,* a sermon against dice-playing as an invention of the devil, written in popular unpolished Latin but with vigor and boldness. Harnack believed it to be a work of Pope Victor I. (§ 36, 1), and therefore «the oldest Christian work in Latin». It was soon observed, however, that the author knew and used writings of Cyprian, especially *Ad Quirinum.* In the introductory phrases (c. 1) the author does not call himself pope, but rather only a bishop, and there is no positive proof that he occupied an Italian see. h) *De rebaptismate* is a polemical work in favor of the validity of heretical baptism and against the theory and practice of Cyprian. The author was a bishop, gifted with a taste for speculation; possibly his name was Ursinus[1]. In his excellent researches, Ernst has shown that it was composed in Africa, very probably in Mauritania, and in 256, a little before the Synod of September 1. of this year. Schüler also agrees that it was composed in that year, but in Italy, he thinks, and after the

[1] *Gennad,* De viris ill., c. 27.

synod just mentioned. Nelke inclines to a date between 255 and 258, probably the earlier figure. i) *De pascha computus.* In Hufmayr's opinion it was written in the fifth year of Gordian, before the Easter of 243 (c. 22), for the purpose of correcting the sixteen-year paschal cycle of Hippolytus (§ 54, 6), by a cleric resident outside of Rome,

a) *A. Harnack,* Eine bisher nicht erkannte Schrift Novatians vom Jahre 249—250 («Cyprian», De laude martyrii), in Texte u. Untersuchungen, Leipzig, 1895, xiii. 4b; cf., against *Harnack, C. Weyman,* in Lit. Rundschau (1895), pp. 331—333. — b) *G. Landgraf,* Über den pseudo-cyprianischen Traktat «Adversus Iudaeos», in Archiv für latein. Lexikographie und Grammatik (1898), xi. 87—97; cf. *Harnack,* in Texte und Untersuchungen, xx, new series (1900) v. 3, 126—135. — c) For *De montibus Sina et Sion* see *Harnack,* ib., 135—147. — d) and e) *Ed. Wölfflin,* Cyprianus de spectaculis, in Archiv für latein. Lexikographie und Grammatik (1892), vii. 1—22. *S. Matzinger,* Des hl. Thascius Caecilius Cyprianus Traktat *De bono pudicitiae* (Inaug.-Diss.), Nürnberg, 1892. Against *Wölfflin* and *Matzinger* cf. *Weyman,* in Histor. Jahrb. (1892), xiii. 737—748; (1893), xiv. 330 f., and *A. Demmler,* in Theol. Quartalschr. (1894), lxxvi. 223—271. — f) *A. Harnack,* Eine bisher nicht erkannte Schrift des Papstes Sixtus II. vom Jahre 257/8, in Texte und Untersuchungen, Leipzig, 1895, xiii 1, 1 to 70; cf. ib., xx, new series (1900), v 3, 116—126. Against *Harnack* see *Jülicher,* in Theol. Literaturzeitung (1896), pp. 19—22; *Funk,* in Theol. Quartalschr. (1896), lxxviii. 691—693; *Benson,* Cyprian, London, 1897, pp. 557 to 564. According to *A. Rombold,* in Theol. Quartalschr. (1900), lxxxii. 546—601, *Ad Novatianum* was written by Cyprian in 255 or 256. *L. Nelke* maintains (see no. 5 of this §) that very probably Pope Cornelius was its author and wrote it about 252. — g) New separate editions of *Adv. aleatores* were published by *A. Miodoński,* Erlangen and Leipzig, 1889 (with a German version), and by *A. Hilgenfeld,* Freiburg, 1889. *A. Harnack,* Der pseudo-cyprianische Traktat *De aleatoribus* etc., in Texte und Untersuchungen, Leipzig, 1888, v. 1; cf. ib., xx, new series (1900), v 3, 112 to 116. Against *Harnack* see *Funk,* in Histor. Jahrb. (1889), x. 1—22, and Kirchengeschichtl. Abhandlungen und Untersuchungen (1899), ii. 209 to 236; *Haussleiter,* in Theol. Literaturblatt (1889), pp. 41—43, 49—51, and in Commentationes Woelfflinianae, Leipzig, 1891, pp. 386—389; Etude critique sur l'opuscule «De aleatoribus» par les membres du séminaire d'histoire ecclésiastique établi à l'Université Catholique de Louvain, Louvain, 1891, with appendix: Une lettre perdue de Saint Paul et le «De aleatoribus», Louvain, 1893. — h) For *De rebaptismate* see *J. Ernst,* in Zeitschr. für kathol. Theol. (1896), xx. 193—255 360—362; (1898), xxii. 179—180; (1900), xxiv 425—462; also in Histor. Jahrb. (1898), xix. 499—522 737 to 771. Cf. *W. Schüler,* in Zeitschr. für wissenschaftl. Theol. (1897), xl. 555—608; *A. Beck,* in «Katholik» (1900), i. 40—64. *Id.,* Kirchl. Studien und Quellen, Hamburg, 1903, pp. 1—58, makes Sixtus II. author of *De rebaptismate,* but doubts somewhat the genuineness of cc. 16—18. — i) *E. Hufmayr,* Die pseudo-cyprianische Schrift «De pascha computus» (Progr.), Augsburg, 1896.

Many other pseudo-cyprianic works were written after the time of Constantine. For *Ad Vigilium episcopum de iudaica incredulitate* see § 16. The *De duodecim abusivis saeculi* (ed. *Hartel,* iii. 152—173) still awaits an investigator of its literary history. The *De singularitate clericorum* (*Hartel,* iii. 173—220) is identical (according to *Dom Morin,* in the Revue Bénédictine [1891], viii. 236 f.) with the *Ad confessores et virgines* of the priest Macrobius,

and was written about the middle of the fourth century (*Gennad.*, De vir. ill., c. 5). *A. Harnack,* Der pseudocyprianische Traktat *De singularitate clericorum,* ein Werk des donatistischen Bischofs Macrobius in Rom, in Texte und Untersuchungen, new series, Leipzig, 1903, ix. 3, accepts and confirms the thesis of Dom Morin. The *De duplici martyrio ad Fortunatum* (*Hartel,* iii. 220—247) was unmasked by *Fr. Lezius,* in Neue Jahrb. für deutsche Theol. (1895), iv. 95—110 184—243, and shown to be a daring forgery of its first editor, Erasmus. — For the poems, current also under the name of Tertullian, *De Genesi, De Sodoma* and *De Iona,* also for *Ad Flavium Felicem de resurrectione mortuorum* cf. § 50, 8; for the poem *Ad senatorem* § 88, 7; for *De pascha* § 87, 8. The *Exhortatio de paenitentia* lacking in Hartel's edition, and recently edited by *A. Miodoński* (Cracow, 1893) is a collection of scriptural texts made for the purpose of refuting the rigorism of Novatian, and dates, according to *C. Wunderer,* Bruchstücke einer afrikanischen Bibelübersetzung in der pseudo-cyprianischen Schrift «Exhort. de paenit.» (Progr., Erlangen, 1889), from about the year 400. For other apocryphal works, lacking in *Hartel,* cf. *Harnack,* Gesch. der altchristl. Literatur, i. 722 f. The *Caena Cypriani* (cf. § 30, 5) and two *Orationes* (*Hartel,* iii. 144—151) are located by *Harnack* about the beginning of the fifth century, and attributed to Cyprianus Gallus (§ 88, 2), in Texte und Untersuchungen, xix new series (1899), iv. 3b. *Michel,* Gebet und Bild, Leipzig, 1902, pp. 77 ff., differs from *Harnack.* — On all the works in the Appendix to Cyprian cf. *P. Monceaux,* Etudes critiques sur l'appendice de St. Cyprien, in Revue de Philol. (1902), xxxvi. 63—98, and also his Cyprien in 1 of this §.

## § 52. Arnobius.

St. Jerome remarks[1] that his name suggests a Greek origin. He flourished in the reign of Diocletian (284—305) at Sicca in Africa Proconsularis, where he was known as a distinguished professor of rhetoric. By a dream *(somniis)* he was led to become a Christian. In order to overcome the diffidence of the bishop to whom he applied for reception into the Christian community, he published a polemical work against heathenism which Jerome calls[2] *Adversus gentes,* but in the only (ninth-century) manuscript that has reached us is entitled *Adversus nationes.* Internal evidence shows that it was composed during the persecution of Diocletian (303—305) or shortly afterwards (cf. i. 13; ii. 5, iv. 36). The contents of the work fall into two parts: the first two books are mostly taken up with an apology for Christianity, while the other five are a polemical attack on heathenism. In the first part he refutes the trite accusation that the Christians are responsible for the actual evils of the time because they had roused the anger of the gods. The religious spirit of the Christians is guaranteed by their faith in a chief and supreme God *(Deus princeps, Deus summus)* and in Christ who died on the Cross as man, but by His miracles proved Himself to be God. That the Christian religion is the true one is proved by its rapid spread, by its influence on the manners of barbarian peoples, and by its harmony with the

[1] Chron. ad a. Abr. 2343 = A. D. 327. [2] De viris ill., c. 79.

opinions of the greatest philosophers. The mention of Plato, as in many things a herald of Christian truth, furnishes the occasion for a long and remarkable excursus on the soul (ii. 14—62). Passing thence to his polemic against heathenism, he undertakes to show that the heathen teaching concerning the divinity is both contradictory and immoral (iii—v). In the sixth book he describes with caustic severity the forms of heathen worship, the temples and the statues, in the seventh book he treats of the sacrificial rites and ceremonies. (The latter book seems really to close with c. 37. The following chapters 38—51 are apparently sketches for some new work against heathenism.) The work of Arnobius did not meet with warm admiration in later Christian times. The declamatory pathos of the old rhetorician, his affected and involved phraseology, the multiplicity of interrogations, become at length very wearisome to the reader[1], all the more so as in Arnobius warmth of conviction and clearness of thought are not prominent. He seems to have hastily put together his apology for Christianity before he had got rid of remnants of heathenism. His religious opinions offer a curious mixture of Christian and heathen ideas: Christ is not equal to the *Deus summus*. In the supposition that the heathen gods really exist, they must be gods of a second order, owing their existence and divine character to the God of the Christians, to whose family they in a sense belong (i. 28; iii. 2—3; vii. 35). The human soul is not the work of God, but of some other celestial being. It is something half divine and half material *(mediae qualitatis, anceps ambiguaque natura)*, in itself perishable, but capable by the grace of God of receiving an imperishable character (ii. 14 ff.). He draws from the didactic poem of Lucretius *(De rerum natura)* his arguments against an absolute eternity, and from the Platonists and Neoplatonists his arguments against the annihilation of the soul. The second part of the work, especially books iii—v, has always attracted the attention of philologists because of its very copious mythological information. He appears to have studied the Roman mythology in the (lost) works of the Neoplatonist Cornelius Labeo, and Greek mythology in the Protrepticus of Clement of Alexandria (§ 38, 3).

The text of Arnobius is based exclusively on *Cod. Paris. 1661*, of the ninth century; cf. § 24, 1. The Editio princeps is that of *F. Sabaeus*, Rome, 1543. For later editions cf. *Schoenemann*, Bibliotheca historico-literaria Patrum Latinorum, i. 160—175. New editions or reprints were brought out by *J. C. Orelli*, 3 vols., Leipzig, 1816—1817; *Migne*, PL., Paris, 1844, v; *G. F. Hildebrand*, Halle, 1844; *Fr. Oehler*, Leipzig, 1846 (*Gersdorf*, Bibl. Patr. eccles. Lat. sel., xii). The best is that of *A. Reifferscheid*, Vienna, 1875 (Corpus script. eccl. Lat., iv). Cf. *Id.*, in Indices scholarum Vratislav. 1877—1878, pp. 9—10; 1879—1880, pp. 8—10. *M. Bastgen*, Quaestiones de locis ex Arnobii Adv. nat. opere selectis (Dissert. inaug.), Münster, 1887. — German versions of Arnobius were made by *Fr. A.*

[1] *Hier.*, Ep. 58, 10.

*v. Besnard,* Landshut, 1842; *J. Alleker,* Trier, 1858. — *E. Freppel,* Commodien, Arnobe, Lactance, Paris, 1893, pp. 28—93. On the diction of Arnobius see *C. Stange,* De Arnobii oratione (Progr.), Saargemünd, 1893; *J. Scharnagl,* De Arnobii maioris latinitate (2 Progr.), Görz, 1894—1895, i—ii; *P. Spindler,* De Arnobii genere dicendi (Dissert.), Strassburg, 1901. — For the «sources» of Arnobius see *G. Kettner,* Cornelius Labeo (Progr.), Naumburg, 1877; *A. Röhricht,* De Clemente Alex. Arnobii in irridendo gentilium cultu deorum auctore (Progr.), Hamburg, 1893. *F. Dal Pane,* Sopra la fonte di un passo (v. 18) di Arnobio, in Studi Italiani di Filologia Classica (1901), ix. 30. — For the doctrine of Arnobius see *K. B. Francke,* Die Psychologie und Erkenntnislehre des Arnobius (Inaug.-Diss.), Leipzig, 1878; *A. Röhricht,* Die Seelenlehre des Arnobius, Hamburg, 1893; *E. F. Schulze,* Das Übel in der Welt nach der Lehre des Arnobius (Inaug.-Diss.), Jena, 1896; *E. Vorontzow,* Apologet Arnobii Afrikanei (Russian), Kharkon (1904), ii. 319—338.

### § 53. Lactantius.

1. HIS LIFE. — Lucius Cælius Firmianus Lactantius, for such was probably his full name, was, according to St. Jerome[1], a disciple of Arnobius, and unquestionably a native of Africa, though local Italian patriotism, without any evidence, claims the honor of his birth for Firmum (Fermo), in the territory of Picenum. His parents were heathens, and the date of his conversion to Christianity is unknown. It is probable that he had already won fame in Africa as a rhetorician when Diocletian made him professor of Latin rhetoric at Nicomedia, the new capital of the empire. The persecution of Diocletian compelled him to quit this office; his subsequent life was probably one of much privation. At an advanced age he appears in Gaul as the tutor of Crispus, the son of Constantine. The time and place of his death are unknown.

*S. Brandt,* Über die dualistischen Zusätze und die Kaiseranreden bei Lactantius. Nebst einer Untersuchung über das Leben des Lactantius und die Entstehungsverhältnisse seiner Prosaschriften (four Essays), in Sitzungsberichte der phil.-histor. Klasse der kgl. Akad. der Wissensch., Vienna, 1889—1891, cxviii—cxxv; cf. *T. E. Mecchi,* Lattanzio e la sua patria, Fermo, 1875. *P. Meyer,* Quaestionum Lactantiarum partic. i. (Progr.), Jülich, 1878. *R. Pichon,* Lactance. Etude sur le mouvement philosophique et religieux sous le règne de Constantin, Paris, 1901.

2. HIS LITERARY LABORS. — Lactantius, like his master Arnobius, was more skilful in his onslaught upon heathenism than in his defence of Christianity *Utinam,* says Jerome[2], *tam nostra affirmare potuisset quam facile aliena destruxit!* Withal, he accomplished more than Arnobius. He is more comprehensive and versatile in his literary work, while his style is more chaste, natural and pleasing than that of any of his contemporaries, *vir omnium suo tempore eloquentissimus, quasi quidam fluvius eloquentiae Tullianae*[3]. The humanists called

[1] De viris ill., c. 80; Chron. ad a. Abr. 2333.
[2] Ep. 58, 10.
[3] *Hier.,* Chron. ad a. Abr. 2333; Ep. 58, 10.

him the Christian Cicero, and in general exhibited an exaggerated admiration for his writings. As early as the fifteenth century his writings, extant in numerous and ancient codices, went through a long series of editions. The real strength of Lactantius is in his formal grace and elegance of expression; like his heathen model he lacks solidity and depth. He had read extensively, and retained and assimilated with great ease the learning of others, which he reproduced in correct and polished phraseology. If we except St. Jerome, and perhaps St. Augustine, no Christian writer of antiquity was so deeply versed in Latin and Greek literature, but conversely his knowledge of ecclesiastical literature, and still more so of the Scripture, was equally meagre and imperfect. St. Jerome accuses him of downright *imperitia scripturarum,* for failing to recognize a third person in the Divinity, or the personal distinction between the Holy Spirit and the Father and the Son[1] He leaned towards Chiliasm[2], and his entire doctrinal and ethical teaching is suffused with a peculiar dualism, best formulated in his thesis that evil is of necessity presupposed to good[3].

The manuscript-tradition of the works of Lactantius is the subject of an exhaustive study by *Brandt* in the prolegomena of his edition. The oldest manuscripts are a *Cod. Bononiensis* of the sixth or seventh century *(Div. inst., De ira Dei, De opif. Dei, Epitome div. inst.)* and a *Cod. Sangallensis rescriptus* of the sixth or seventh century *(Div. inst.).* The *editio princeps* appeared at Subiaco in 1465, it is the first dated book printed in Italy. During the eighteenth century appeared the complete editions of *Chr. A. Heumann,* Göttingen, 1736; *J. L. Buenemann,* Leipzig, 1739; *J. B. Le Brun* and *N. Lenglet du Fresnoy,* 2 vols., Paris, 1748; *F. Eduardus a S. Xaverio,* 11 vols., Rome, 1754—1759. The edition of *Le Brun* and *du Fresnoy* is reprinted in *Migne,* PL., Paris, 1844, vi to vii). *Brandt* was the first to make a comprehensive and critical use of the extant manuscripts: L. C. F. Lactanti opera omnia, rec. *S. Brandt* et *G. Laubmann,* 2 vols., Vienna, 1890—1897 (Corpus script. eccles. Lat. xix xxvii). — *P. Bertold,* Prolegomena zu Lactantius (Progr.), Metten, 1861. *Freppel,* Commodien, Arnobe, Lactance, Paris, 1893, pp. 94—148. — *H. Limberg,* Quo iure Lactantius appellatur Cicero christianus? (Dissert. inaug.), Münster, 1896. *H. Glaesener,* Several grammatical and philological articles, in Musée Belge (1901), v 5—27. *S. Brandt,* Lactantius und Lucretius, in Neue Jahrb. für Philol. und Pädag. (1891), cxliii. 225—259. *P. G. Frotscher,* Des Apologeten Lactantius Verhältnis zur griechischen Philosophie (Inaug.-Diss.), Leipzig, 1895. — *E. Overlach,* Die Theologie des Lactantius (Progr.), Schwerin, 1858. *M. E. Heinig,* Die Ethik des Lactantius (Inaug.-Diss.), Grimma, 1887 *Fr. Marbach,* Die Psychologie des Firmianus Lactantius (Inaug.-Diss.), Halle, 1889.

3. DIVINAE INSTITUTIONES. — His most important work is a series of religious instructions in seven books, *Divinarum institutionum libri VII,* at once an apology and a manual of theology. The purpose of the author is first to put to silence all the opponents

[1] Comm. in Gal. ad iv. 6; Ep. 84, 7. [2] Div. inst., vii. 14 ff.
[3] Cf. De ira Dei, c. 15.

of the Christian faith. Proceeding then from the negative to the affirmative, he undertakes to describe «the whole contents of the Christian doctrine» (v. 4). The title itself is instructive; he borrowed it from the current manuals of legal science[1]. The first two books, *De falsa religione* and *De origine erroris*, are devoted to the refutation of the superstitions of polytheism and to the demonstration of monotheism as the only true religion. The third book, *De falsa sapientia*, attacks the philosophy of the heathen, as being, next to their false religion, the source of their errors. From the mutually destructive systems of philosophy one turns with satisfaction to God's revelation of Himself, which concept furnishes the transit to the fourth book, *De vera sapientia et religione*. True wisdom consists in the knowledge and worship of God; these have been given to mankind through Christ, the Son of God. The fifth book, *De iustitia*, treats of that justice to which men return through Christ. Its basis is that piety *(pietas)* which is rooted in the knowledge of God, and its essence is that equity *(aequitas)* which sees in all men children of God. The sixth book, *De vero cultu*, goes to show that in the exercise of this justice lies the true worship of God. Hereupon he explains the two essential qualities of all justice, *religio* and *misericordia vel humanitas*. In the seventh book, finally, he crowns his work with a description of heaven *(De vita beata)*, the reward of all true worship of God. Lactantius is the first among the Western Christians to exhibit in a connected system the Christian views of life and man. He knows and uses the works of earlier apologists such as Minucius Felix, Tertullian, Cyprian and Theophilus of Antioch. He quotes the Scripture occasionally from St. Cyprian's so-called *Testimonia adversus Iudaeos*, but abounds still more in quotations from classic authors. This work was written during the persecution of Diocletian and Galerius (305—310) in part at Nicomedia and in part elsewhere (v. 2, 2; 11, 15). The so-called dualistic phrases found in some manuscripts, to the effect that God willed and created evil (ii. 8, 6; vii. 5, 27)[2] are interpolations, but according to Brandt inserted as early as the fourth century. Brandt attributes to this interpolator certain more or less lengthy discourses to Constantine, that are found in the same manuscripts (i. 1, 12, vii. 27, 2 etc.); others hold them to be genuine elements of a second edition of the work.

*Brandt*, Über die dualistischen Zusätze und die Kaiseranreden (see § 53, 1). In favor of the genuineness of the dualistic additions see *J. G. Th. Müller*, Quaestiones Lactantianae (Dissert. inaug.), Göttingen, 1875, and of the discourses to Constantine *J. Belser*, in Theol. Quartalschr. (1898), lxxx. 548—588. — For the Scriptural quotations see the edition of *Brandt*, l. c. (1890), i. xcvii ff. The date of composition is discussed by *Lobmüller*, in «Katholik» (1898), ii. 1—23.

[1] Institutiones civilis iuris, i. 1, 12.

[2] Cf. De opificio Dei, c. 19, 8.

4. EPITOME DIV. INST. DE OPIFICIO DEI. DE IRA DEI. — At the request of a certain Pentadius, whom he addresses as *Pentadi frater,* Lactantius prepared, about 315, a summary of his large work and entitled it *Epitome divinarum institutionum.* It is really a new, but abbreviated recension of the work. The suspicions occasionally manifested concerning its genuineness are nowise justified. In the treatise *De opificio Dei,* addressed to Demetrianus, a former disciple, and written before the *Institutiones* (about 304; cf. c. 6, 15; 15, 6; 20), Lactantius maintains against the Epicureans, that the human organism is a «creation of God», a work of Providence. After an anatomical and physiological description of the human body and a teleological commentary on its constitution (cc. 5—13), he discusses in the second part some psychological questions (cc. 16—19); the dualistic addition in c. 19, 8 are discussed above (§ 53, 3). Brandt is of opinion that Lactantius composed the first part of this work on the basis of some Hermetic book. The treatise *De ira Dei,* addressed to a certain Donatus, and written after the Institutiones (c. 2, 4 6, 11, 2)[1] is directed against the Epicurean doctrine of the absolute indifference *(apathia)* of the divinity; from the very nature of religion Lactantius deduces the necessity of a divine wrath.

The *Epitome* was translated into German by *P. H. Jansen,* Kempten, 1875 (Bibl. der Kirchenväter); the *De ira Dei* by *R. Storf,* ib.; the *De opificio Dei* by *A. Knappitsch,* Graz, 1898. For the sources of the De opif. Dei cf. *Brandt,* Wiener Studien (1891), xiii. 255—292.

5. DE MORTIBUS PERSECUTORUM. — In this work are narrated the wretched deaths of the imperial persecutors of the Christians, indeed, its purpose is to show that the God of the Christians has truly manifested his power and greatness against the enemies of His name (c. 1, 7). In the introduction it treats briefly of Nero, Domitian, Decius, Valerian, and Aurelian. The closing days of Diocletian, Maximian, Galerius, Severus and Maximinus are described with greater fulness. The narrator writes from personal experience; in the years 311 and 313 he was resident in Nicomedia (cc. 35 48, cf. c. 1), where the book was probably written in 314. The entire story breathes an atmosphere of vivid personal impressions received during those days of horror; it has not yet been proved that the narrator has anywhere consciously perverted the truth of history. Only one (eleventh century) manuscript of the work has reached us. It is entitled: *Lucii Caecilii liber ad Donatum confessorem de mort. persec.* In many manuscripts Lactantius is called Lucius Caelius or Lucius Caecilius, and we have seen already that he dedicated his treatise *De ira Dei* to a certain Donatus. According to Jerome[2], Lactantius left a work *De persecutione* which universal consent identifies with the

[1] Cf. Div. inst., ii. 17, 5. [2] De viris ill., c. 80.

*De mortibus persecutorum*. Finally there is a minute correspondence of style and diction between this work and the other writings of Lactantius. Its fundamental concept appears also in the Institutiones (v. 23). Even the peculiar features of the work, its irritated sentiment and impassioned tone are easily understood from the nature of the subject-matter. The most recent editor, Brandt, stands almost alone in maintaining that Lactantius is not the author of the *De mortibus persecutorum*. There is no solid basis, however, for his hypothesis that Lactantius spent the time from 311 to 313 in Gaul.

This work was first edited by *Stephen Baluze,* Paris, 1679; for new separate editions we are indebted to *Fr. Dübner,* Paris, 1863, 1879; *Brandt,* Vienna, 1897. It is reprinted in *Hurter,* SS. Patr. opusc. sel., Innsbruck, 1873, xxii. It was translated into German by *P. H. Jansen,* Kempten, 1875 (Bibl. der Kirchenväter). The question of authorship is discussed by *Ad. Ebert,* in Berichte über die Verhandlungen der kgl. sächs. Gesellsch. der Wissensch., Leipzig, 1870, xxii. 115—138 (for Lactantius); *Brandt,* Über die Entstehungsverhältnisse der Prosaschriften des Lactantius (see § 53, 1) pp. 22—122 and in Neue Jahrb. für Philol. und Pädag. (1893), cxlvii. 121—138 203—223 (against Lactantius); *J. Belser,* in Theol. Quartalschr. (1892), lxxiv. 246—293 439—464; (1898), lxxx. 547—596 (for Lactantius); *O. Seeck,* Gesch. des Untergangs der antiken Welt, Berlin, 1895, i. 426—430 (for Lactantius). — *J. Rothfuchs,* Qua historiae fide Lactantius usus sit in libro De mort. persec. (Progr.), Marburg, 1862. *Belser,* Grammatisch-kritische Erklärung von Lactantius' «De mort. persec.» c. 34 (Progr.), Ellwangen, 1889. For minor articles of *A. Crivellucci, A. Mancini* and *Brandt* see Studi Storici (1893), ii. 45—48 374—388 444—464; (1894), iii. 65—70; (1896), v. 555—571. *J. Kopp,* Über den Verfasser des Buches «De mortibus persecutorum» (Dissert.), Munich, 1902 (for Lactantius).

6. DE AVE PHOENICE. SPURIOUS POEMS. — The poem *De ave Phoenice* relates in eighty-five distichs the myth of the miraculous bird that dwelt in the sacred grove of the Sun-God as his priest, whence every thousand years it came on earth to mount its own funeral pyre, and from its own ashes rose to a new life. There is a long series of witnesses, beginning with Gregory of Tours[1], for the authorship of Lactantius; most modern critics admit it, even Brandt, though he ascribes it not to the Christian but to the heathen period of his life. Nevertheless, the work has a specific Christian color, and both in matter and style exhibits many Christian peculiarities. The Phoenix was looked on as a symbol of the resurrection. The poem *De resurrectione (De pascha)* is not a work of Lactantius, but rather of Venantius Fortunatus[2]. The poem *De passione Domini* belongs to the end of the fifteenth century.

*De ave Phoenice* in *Brandt's* edition (1893), ii. 1, 135—147; cf. xviii to xxii. On the origin of the myth see *H. Dechent*, in Rhein. Mus. für Philol., new series (1880), xxxv. 39—55; *R. Loebe*, in Jahrb. für protest. Theol. (1892), xviii. 34—65; *Brandt,* in Rhein. Mus. für Philol., new series

[1] De cursu stellarum, c. 12. [2] *Carm.*, iii. 9.

(1892), xlvii. 390—403; *A. Knappitsch,* De L. C. F. Lactanti «ave Phoenice» (Progr.), Graz, 1896 (with a German metrical version). The *De passione Domini* is in *Brandt,* l. c., pp. 148—151; cf. xxii—xxxiii. *C. Pascal,* Sul carme «De ave Phoenice» attributo a Lattanzio, Napole, 1904. For a collection of metrical enigmas see below § 53, 7 a.

7. LOST WRITINGS. FRAGMENTS. — Lactantius intended to publish a work against all heresies[1], and another against the Jews[2], but he seems not to have carried out his purpose. Several other works have perished: a) *Symposium quod adolescentulus scripsit Africae*[3], perhaps a discussion of grammatical or rhetorical questions in the form of a banquet-dialogue. The title of Symposium may have been the occasion for attributing to him one hundred metrical enigmas, each in three hexameters, that are otherwise adjudged to a certain Symphosius; b) Hodoeporicum *(ὁδοιπορικόν) Africa usque Nicomediam hexametris scriptum versibus*[4]; c) *Grammaticus*[5]; d) *Ad Asclepiadem libri duo*[6]; the recipient is probably identical with the homonymous author of a work addressed to Lactantius, *De providentia summi Dei*[7]; e) *Ad Probum epistolarum libri quattuor*[8]. This is perhaps the collection of letters to which pope Damasus refers when he tells us[9] that Lactantius wrote letters in which he dealt mostly with metre, geography and philosophy, but rarely touched on matters of Christian theology; f) *Ad Severum epistolarum libri duo*[10]; g) *Ad Demetrianum* (§ 53, 4) *auditorem suum epistolarum libri duo*[11]. The letters treated of the Holy Ghost, and of other subjects (cf. § 53, 2). h) In a codex of the eighth or ninth century there is a fragment on divers passions — hope, fear, love, hatred etc. — with the marginal note *Lactantius de motibus animi.* It may be genuine, but cannot be definitely assigned to any of his writings.

The collection of metrical enigmas is in *Migne,* PL., vii. 289—298. It is not in the edition of *Brandt;* cf. *Teuffel-Schwabe,* Gesch. der röm. Literatur, 5. ed., pp. 1152 f. For the other works mentioned see the quotations and fragments in *Brandt,* l. c. (1893), ii. 1, 155—160, with the pertinent literature.

## B. ROMAN WRITERS.

### § 54. Hippolytus.

1. HIS LIFE. — The authorship of the «Refutation of all Heresies», *κατὰ πασῶν αἱρέσεων ἔλεγχος,* or *Philosophumena* (see § 54, 3), a large and important work discovered in 1851, awakened much interest at the time. Since then the authorship of the work has been extensively, but so far inconclusively, discussed. The first of its ten books was

[1] Div. inst., iv. 30, 14; De ira Dei, c. 2, 6. [2] Div. inst., vii. 1, 26.
[3] *Hier.,* De viris ill., c. 80. [4] Ib. [5] Ib. [6] Ib.
[7] Div. inst., vii. 4, 17. [8] *Hier.,* l. c. [9] *Hier.,* Ep. 35, 2.
[10] *Hier.,* De viris ill., c. 80; cf. c. 111. [11] Ib.

long current under the name of Origen. That it could not be from his pen was wellk-nown from the title of bishop *(ἀρχιερατεία)* which the author gives himself in the preface, that being an office that Origen never filled. In 1842 Mynoides Mynas brought to Paris from Mount Athos a fourteenth-century manuscript containing books iv—x of the work. They were edited by E. Miller in 1851, curiously enough as a work of Origen. The second and third books are still lacking. The authorship of Origen was at once rejected on all sides and five other possible authors suggested. These were Hippolytus, Beron, Cajus, Novatian and Tertullian. The preponderance of opinion was in favor of Hippolytus, for whom Döllinger (1853) and Volkmar (1855) pleaded with special success. It was easy to show that Beron, against whom Hippolytus was said to have written *(κατὰ Βήρωνος)*, belonged at the earliest to the fourth century, nor could the claims of the Anti-Montanist Cajus be maintained in face of the critical arguments opposed to it. In the course of the controversy the names of Novatian and Tertullian were gradually abandoned. In a general way the name of Hippolytus stands for the Philosophumena, as often as it becomes necessary to refer to some definite person as author of the work. It is true that this work is not mentioned in the ancient catalogue of the writings of Hippolytus (§ 54, 2. But other writings claimed as his by the author in the preface to the Philosophumena, e. g. the so-called Syntagma (Philos. prooem.), the Chronicon (x. 30), and the work on the nature of the Universe (x. 32), are otherwise known to be works of Hippolytus. There is also a striking similarity between the Philosophumena and other acknowledged writings of Hippolytus, e. g. the work against Noetus, and *De Antichristo*. Finally, the meagre and contradictory information concerning Hippolytus that antiquity has bequeathed us is placed in an entirely new light by the details furnished in the Philosophumena concerning the life and times of its author. Not only are the known facts of Hippolytus's life notably increased, but the former accounts of him are rendered now for the first time intelligible. In Western tradition Hippolytus had become the centre of a legendary cycle, through the mazes of which it was difficult to reach the kernel of historical truth. The Philosophumena put an end to the almost unexampled confusion that hitherto had surrounded his person. — The Oriental tradition was right, according to this work, in maintaining that Hippolytus, a disciple of St. Irenaeus[1], had really been a bishop of Rome. He was the rival of Pope Callixtus (217—222), the head of a schismatical party, and therefore one of the first anti-popes known to history It is true that our only account of this situation comes from the Philosophumena itself (ix. 7 11 12), but we cannot therefore accuse its author of a de-

[1] *Phot.*, Bibl. Cod. 121.

liberate intention to calumniate his adversary Nevertheless, we must carefully distinguish between the facts which are related and the coloring that the narrative puts upon them. Callixtus appears in ecclesiastical history as one of the most worthy among the popes. His adversary was a subordinationist in doctrine, and in church discipline he held a sectarian rigorism. Callixtus had softened the severe penitential discipline by permitting those guilty of adultery or of fornication to be again received into ecclesiastical communion, after performance of the penance enjoined[1] In other matters also he had shown himself disposed to gentler measures, e. g. with regard to the reconciliation of those who returned from heresy or schism, the treatment of unworthy bishops, the advancement of bigamists to the higher ecclesiastical offices, and the like. To Hippolytus all this savoured of unprincipled levity (Philos. ix. 12), though he does not undertake to justify his passionate denunciation of it. In so far as his views are not the result of personal opposition to Callixtus, they can only represent an erroneous concept of the nature and scope of ecclesiastical authority, and a lack of sympathetic intelligence for the needs of the time. He describes himself frequently as the most decided adversary of the Patripassian doctrine, of the Novatians, and of Sabellius. But his own theology aroused criticism, and was declared by Callixtus a pure ditheism (Philos. ix. 12). According to Hippolytus the Logos existed first impersonally in the Father, undistinguished from Him in substance; he was the unspoken word of the Father, *λόγος ἐνδιάθετος*; later, when the Father willed it, and as He willed it, *ὅτε ἠθέλησεν, καθὼς ἠθέλησεν*[2], the Word came forth from the Father, *λόγος προφορικός*, as another than He, *ἕτερος*. Only in the Incarnation did He become the true and perfect Son of the Father. The alleged relation between the Father and the Son is therefore strictly subordinationist in character. Hippolytus does not hesitate even to say (Philos. x. 33) that God, had He so willed, might have made God also any man (or *the* man), instead of the Logos *(εἰ γὰρ θεόν σε ἠθέλησε ποιῆσαι, ἐδύνατο ἔχεις τοῦ λόγου τὸ παράδειγμα)*. The reproach of ditheism is therefore in so far true that Hippolytus recognized a distinction of substance between the Father and the Logos; the latter was only genetically God. But when Hippolytus says of Callixtus (Philos. ix. 12) that «he falls sometimes into the error of Sabellius and sometimes into that of Theodotus», he can only mean that on the one hand Callixtus maintained the equality and unity of nature in the Father and the Son, without denying, as did Sabellius, the distinction of persons; and on the other maintained the perfect humanity of the Redeemer, without denying His divinity, as did Theodotus. The schism of Hippolytus did not spread; even in Rome

[1] *Tert.*, De pudicit., c. 1. [2] C. Noet., c. 10.

his faction seems to have been short-lived. There are many reasons for supposing that Hippolytus himself, shortly before his death, put an end to the schism. In 235 he was banished to Sardinia in the company of St. Pontianus, the second successor of Callixtus. There, if not earlier and at Rome, Pope and Anti-pope appear to have become reconciled. There, too, both succumbed to the sufferings and privations of their lot. Their bodies were finally interred at Rome on the same day, August 13. in 236 or 237; the same date was also chosen for the commemoration of both.

*J. Döllinger,* Hippolytus und Kallistus, Ratisbon, 1853. *G. Volkmar,* Die Quellen der Ketzergeschichte bis zum Nicänum. 1: Hippolytus und die römischen Zeitgenossen, Zürich, 1855. *Hergenröther,* Hippolytus oder Novatian? in Österreich. Vierteljahresschr. für kathol. Theol. (1863), ii. 289 to 340 (he defends the authorship of Hippolytus). *C. de Smedt* S. J., Dissertationes selectae in primam aetatem historiae eccles., Gand, 1876, pp. 83 to 189 (for Hippolytus). *Grisar,* Bedarf die Hippolytusfrage einer Revision? in Zeitschr. für kathol. Theol. (1878), ii. 505—533 (for Novatian). *Funk,* Über den Verfasser der Philosophumenen, in Theol. Quartalschr. (1881), lxiii. 423—464; *Id.,* Kirchengeschichtl. Abhandlungen und Untersuchungen (1899), ii. 161—197 (for Hippolytus). *J. B. de Rossi,* in Bullettino di archeologia cristiana, Ser. 3, a. vi (1881), 5—55; Ser. 4, a. i (1882), 9—76, a. ii (1883), 60—65, maintains that Hippolytus did not die in Sardinia but returned to Rome in the reign of Philippus Arabs (244 to 249) and took part in the schism of Novatian. In the persecution of Valerian (253—260) he was condemned as a Christian, and on his way to death recognized the error of his ways and besought his friends to return to the unity of the Church. *C. Erbes,* Die Lebenszeit des Hippolytus, in Jahrbücher f. protest. Theol. (1888), xiv 611—656 (Hippolytus died Jan. 29./30., 251). *J. B. Lightfoot,* The Apostolic Fathers, part I (S. Clement of Rome), London, 1890, ii. 317—477: Hippolytus of Portus (Hippolytus was a bishop of the floating population in the maritime town of Portus, but resident at Rome). *G. Ficker,* Studien zur Hippolytfrage, Leipzig, 1893 (supports the theses of Döllinger as against the objections of de Rossi and Lightfoot). — The most important «testimonia antiquorum» concerning Hippolytus are found in *H. Achelis,* Hippolytstudien, in Texte und Untersuchungen, Leipzig, 1897, xvi. 4, 1—62. *K. J. Neumann,* Hippolytus von Rom in seiner Stellung zu Staat und Welt. Neue Funde und Forschungen zur Geschichte von Staat und Kirche in der römischen Kaiserzeit, Leipzig, 1892, fasc. i. *J. Dräseke,* Zum Syntagma des Hippolytus, in Zeitschr. für wissenschaftl. Theol. (1902), xlv. 58—80; *Id.,* Noëtos und die Noetianer in der Hippolytus-Refutatio ix. 6—10, ib. (1903), xlvi. 213—232.

2. HIS LITERARY LABORS. — Shortly before or after his death, a marble statue was erected at Rome in honor of Hippolytus by his schismatical followers. In 1551, during the progress of certain excavations, it was discovered intact, with the exception of the head. On either side of the chair in which the saint is seated his paschal cycle has been inscribed, while on the rounded surface that unites the back of the chair with the left side of the same are likewise inscribed the titles of many of his works. This catalogue is com-

pleted and illustrated by the accounts given in Eusebius[1], St. Jerome[2], and other writers. The works of Hippolytus fill us with astonishment, so extensive and varied are they, while for erudition no Western contemporary can approach him. On occasions, however, he was content to repeat himself, as is evident from a comparison of his commentary on Daniel with his previous work *De Antichristo*. The better and greater part of his labors was in the field of exegesis. Photius praises[3] the simplicity and clearness of his style, without pronouncing it really Attic. At present, with the exception of a few imperfect works, we possess only fragments of Hippolytus, in Greek, Latin, Syriac, Coptic, Arabic, Ethiopic, Armenian, and Slavonic. The manuscript tradition of his writings could scarcelly be more broken and fragmentary; their remnants turn up in the remotest parts of the antique world. Often, indeed, these fragments must be re-shaped and their text cleansed from foreign scoria; only here and there can the original text be restored with comparative freedom from gaps and breaks.

The statue is reproduced in *F. X. Kraus,* Real-Encyklopädie der christl. Altertümer, Freiburg, 1882—1886, i. 660—664; cf. *J. Ficker,* Die altchristlichen Bildwerke im christlichen Museum des Laterans, Leipzig, 1890, pp. 166 ff. *Marucchi,* Guida del Museo Cristiano Lateranense, Roma, 1898, pp. 79 ff. — His writings and their fragments (except the Philosophumena) were collected by *J. A. Fabricius,* S. Hippolyti episc. et mart. opp. Gr. et Lat., 2 vols., Hamburg, 1716—1718; *Gallandi,* Bibl. vet. Patr. (1766), ii; *Migne,* PG. (1857), x; *P. A. de Lagarde,* Hippolyti Rom. quae feruntur omnia graece, Leipzig and London, 1858. A new edition of the entire works of Hippolytus is appearing in «Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der drei ersten Jahrhunderte» Hippolytus' Werke, i. Exegetische und homiletische Schriften, herausgegeben von *G. N. Bonwetsch* und *H. Achelis,* Leipzig, 1897; cf. Catholic University Bulletin, Washington, 1900, vi. 63 to 76. Collections of Syriac fragments are met with in *de Lagarde,* Analecta Syriaca, Leipzig and London, 1858, pp. 79—91, also in *Pitra,* Analecta sacra (1883), iv. 36—64 306—331. Armenian fragments, in *Pitra,* l. c., ii. 226—239; iv. 64—71 331—337. For Old-Slavonic texts cf. *Bonwetsch,* in *Harnack,* Gesch. der altchristlichen Literatur, i. 893—897. — Brief studies on all the literary labors of Hippolytus, in *C. P. Caspari,* Ungedruckte Quellen zur Geschichte des Taufsymbols, Christiania, 1875, iii. 377—409; *Lightfoot,* l. c. (§ 54, 1), ii. 388—405, and *Harnack,* l. c., i. 605—646; *Duchesne,* Histoire ancienne de l'Église, 2. éd., Paris 1906, tome i, c. xvii.

3. THE PHILOSOPHUMENA AND OTHER POLEMICAL WORKS. — As we have already remarked (§ 54, 1) the Philosophumena are not mentioned, neither on the statue of Hippolytus nor in the catalogue of his works by Eusebius and Jerome. Photius calls them[4] «the labyrinth», *τὸν λαβύρινθον*, and Theodoret of Cyrus[5] calls the work of Hippolytus against Artemon «the little labyrinth», *ὁ σμικρὸς λαβύρινθος*. It is

[1] Hist. eccl., vi. 22. [2] De viris ill., c. 61. [3] Bibl. Cod. 121 202.
[4] Bibl. Cod. 48. [5] Haeret. fabul. comp. ii. 5.

not improbable that the author called himself his work «the labyrinth of heresies» (cf. x. 5: *τὸν λαβύρινθον τῶν αἱρέσεων*). In the course of the work (ix. 8) he refers to the first four books as follows: *ἐν τοῖς φιλοσοφουμένοις* sc. *δόγμασιν*, i. e. «in the description of philosophical doctrines». The traditional extension of the title «Philosophumena» to the whole work rests on no intrinsic evidence. In the preface he proposes to convince heretics that they have not taken their teachings from the Holy Scriptures or the Tradition but from the wisdom of the Hellenes, *ἐκ τῆς Ἑλλήνων σοφίας*. Hence the comprehensive account of Hellenic philosophy to which the first four books are devoted. In the first book there is an outline-sketch of Greek philosophy, based, however, on very unreliable sources. From the conclusion of the first book it seems certain that the second book dealt with «the mysteries and all the curious fancies of individuals about the stars or spaces». The contents of the third book must have been similar, for at the beginning of the fourth (in the beginning mutilated) he is still combating astrology and magic. This fourth book is doubtless identical with his work «Against the Magi» *(κατὰ μάγων)* that he refers to elsewhere (vi. 39). The second part of the work opens with the fifth book, the description of the heresies, and the proof of their heathen origin. Besides the accounts of such earlier heresiologists as Irenæus he made use of a number of works that he took for genuine writings of the heretics, but which, in the hypothesis of some modern writers like Salmon and Stähelin, were only clever forgeries. The tenth and last book contains a summary recapitulation of the whole work. The work was probably composed towards the end of his life. He seems to refer (x. 30) to the Chronicle of Hippolytus. In any case the pontificate of Callixtus is described (ix. 11—13) as a thing of the past. — A smaller work against all heresies[1], published long before the composition of the Philosophumena (see the preface of the latter), is usually known since Photius[2] as the «Syntagma». The latter writer tells us that it contained the refutation of thirty-two heresies, *σύνταγμα κατὰ αἱρέσεων λβ'*, beginning with the Dositheans and ending with the Noetians. It is now lost, but its contents have been incorporated with the writings of such later heresiologists as Pseudo-Tertullian *(Libellus adversus omnes haereses)*, Epiphanius *(Haereses)*, and Philastrius *(Liber de haeresibus)*. The fragment of a work against the Patripassian Noetus, known in the manuscripts as *Ὁμιλία εἰς τὴν αἵρεσιν Νοήτου τινὸς*, is no homily, but the ending of a comprehensive anti-heretical work, either the Syntagma or a work otherwise unknown to us. Of a work against Marcion, known to Eu-

[1] *Eus.*, Hist. eccl., vi. 22; *Hier.*, De viris ill., c. 61.
[2] Bibl. Cod. 121.

sebius[1] and St. Jerome[2], only the title has been preserved; perhaps it is identical with a work mentioned in the statue-catalogue as *περὶ τἀγαθοῦ καὶ πόθεν τὸ κακόν*. Another lost work, the famous *Anonymus adversus Artemon*, an Ebionite Monarchian, used by Eusebius[3] and Theodoret of Cyrus[4] was very probably written by Hippolytus[5]. His work in defence of the Gospel and the Apocalypse of St. John, mentioned in the statue-catalogue, *(τ)ὰ ὑπὲρ τοῦ κατὰ Ἰωάνην ε(ὐα)γγελίου καὶ ἀποκαλύψεως*, has perished; not even a fragment of it has reached us. It was probably written against the so-called Alogi who wished to banish from the Church all the writings of St. John. Some very interesting fragments of a Syriac version of another work of Hippolytus on the Apocalypse, known to Ebedjesu († 1318) as *Capita adversus Caium* (in Greek probably *κεφάλαια κατὰ Γαΐου*), were published by J. Gwynn (1888—1890). The Anti-Montanist Caius had pronounced the Apocalypse to be a work of Cerinthus. It taught, he said, a millenarian kingdom of carnal joys, and was therefore contradictory of the recognized canonical and apostolical writings. Principally Anti-Montanistic also, in all probability, was the work entitled on the statue *περὶ χαρισμάτων ἀποστολικὴ παράδοσις*, unless we aught to read two titles: *περὶ χαρισμάτων* and *ἀποστολικὴ παράδοσις*. There is good reason to believe that the same work is the basis of that section of the Apostolic Constitutions which treats of the «charismata» (viii. 1—2).

Editions of the Philosophumena were published by *E. Miller*, Oxford, 1851; *L. Duncker* and *F. G. Schneidewin*, Göttingen, 1859; *P. Cruice*, Paris, 1860. The Duncker and Schneidewin edition is reprinted in *Migne*, PG., xvi. 3, among the works of Origen. The first book of the Philosophumena is accessible in a new recension in *H. Diels*, Doxographi Graeci, Berlin, 1879, pp. 551—576; cf. pp. 144—156. For the literature of the subject cf. § 54, 1. *G. Salmon*, The Cross-References in the «Philosophumena», in Hermathena (1885), v. 389—402; *J. Dräseke*, Zur «refutatio omnium haeresium» des Hippolytus, in Zeitschrift f. wissenschaftl. Theol. (1902), xlv. 263—289. The latter, following a hypothesis of Bunsen, attributes to Hippolytus chapters 11 and 12 of the Epistle to Diognetus (§ 22); they were taken, he thinks, from the Philosophumena. Without specifying the work whence they were taken, it has been shown by grave intrinsic arguments that they are really from the hand of Hippolytus; cf. *G. N. Bonwetsch*, Der Autor der Schlußkapitel des Briefes an Diognet (Nachrichten der Akad. der Wissensch., philol.-hist. Kl., Göttingen, 1902, fasc. II). *H. Stähelin*, Die gnostischen Quellen Hippolyts in seiner Hauptschrift gegen die Häretiker (Texte und Untersuchungen, vi. 3), Leipzig, 1890, pp. 1—108. Concerning the Syntagma and the fragment of Contra Noetum see *R. A. Lipsius*, Die Quellen der ältesten Ketzergeschichte neu untersucht, Leipzig, 1875, pp. 91—190. The fragments of the *Capita adversus Caium* were published in Syriac and in English by *J. Gwynn*, Hippolytus and his «Heads against Caius», in Hermathena (1888), vi. 397—418; Hippolytus

[1] *Eus.*, Hist. eccl., vi. 22.
[2] *Hier.*, De viris ill., c. 61.
[3] *Eus.*, Hist. eccl., v. 28.
[4] Haeret. fabul. comp. ii. 5.
[5] *Phot.*, Bibl. Cod. 48.

on St. Matth. xxiv. 15—22, in Hermathena (1890), vii. 137—150. There is a German version of these fragments in the Berlin edition of Hippolytus, i. 2, 241—247, where the two fragments on Mt. xxiv. 15 ff., that Gwynn attributed to the commentary of Hippolytus on Matthew, are rightly adjudged to the *Capita adversus Caium*. For the other five fragments on passages of the Apocalypse see *Th. Zahn*, Gesch. des neutestamentl. Kanons, ii. 2, 973—991: «Hippolytus gegen Caius» (an excellent dissertation).

4. APOLOGETIC AND DOCTRINAL WRITINGS. — Towards the end of the Philosophumena (x. 32) the author refers to an earlier work *περὶ τῆς τοῦ παντὸς οὐσίας*, doubtless the one entitled on the statue-catalogue *πρὸς Ἕλληνας καὶ πρὸς Πλάτωνα ἢ καὶ περὶ τοῦ παντός*. A fragment of it survives under the title *Ἰωσήπου ἐκ τοῦ (πρὸς Ἕλληνας) λόγου τοῦ ἐπιγεγραμμένου κατὰ Πλάτωνος (Πλάτωνα) περὶ τῆς τοῦ παντὸς αἰτίας*. It treats of Hades, the joys of the just and the sufferings of the wicked; in its traditional form it contains heterogeneous and spurious elements. Photius was acquainted[1] with a work in two books known as *Ἰωσήπου περὶ τοῦ παντός*, written against Plato and the theories of the Platonist Alcinous on the soul, matter and the resurrection. It undertook also to prove that the Jewish people was more ancient than the Hellenes. The fragment entitled *ἀποδεικτικὴ πρὸς Ἰουδαίους* deals with the misfortunes of the Jews and traces them to their crime against the Messias. It is of doubtful authenticity, none of the ancients mentions any large work of Hippolytus against the Jews. — The work *De Antichristo*[2] is unique among the writings of Hippolytus, being the only one of which the complete text has come down to us. It purposes to describe fully, according to the Scriptures, the person and the works of Antichrist. It is dedicated to a certain Theophilus, a friend of the author, and was written about 202. The statue-catalogue mentions a work *περὶ θ(εο)ῦ καὶ σαρκὸς ἀναστάσεως*; and St. Jerome[3] was acquainted with a work of Hippolytus *De resurrectione*. Some fragments of a treatise of Hippolytus «To the Empress Julia Mammæa on the resurrection» are preserved in Syriac; she was the mother of the Emperor Alexander Severus (222—235). Perhaps two fragments of Hippolytus *ἐκ τῆς πρὸς βασιλίδα τινὰ ἐπιστολῆς*, preserved in Theodoret of Cyrus, and a fragment in Anastasius Sinaita *ἐκ τοῦ περὶ ἀναστάσεως καὶ ἀφθαρσίας λόγου*, belong to this work. The *προτρεπτικὸς πρὸς Σεβηρεῖναν*, mentioned in the statue-catalogue, is otherwise unknown, and apparently it has utterly perished. The same fate has befallen the work *De dispensatione* (*περὶ οἰκονομίας*, the Incarnation) mentioned by the Syrian Ebedjesu.

For the fragment of «the Origin of the Universe» cf. *Harnack*, Gesch. der altchristl. Lit., i. 622 f.; *J. Dräseke*, Zu Hippolytus' «Demonstratio adversus Iudaeos», in Jahrb. f. protest. Theol. (1886), xii. 456—461. The

[1] Ib. [2] *Hier.*, De viris ill., c. 61. [3] Ib.

work «On Antichrist», was edited by *Achelis* in the Berlin edition of Hippolytus, i. 2, 3—47, with the aid (for the first time) of a Jerusalem codex of the tenth century and of a Slavonic version translated (1895) into German by *Bonwetsch*. For earlier editions and the manuscript-tradition cf. *Achelis,* Hippolytstudien, pp. 65—93. The edition of Achelis is discussed by *P. Wendland* in Hermes (1899), xxxiv. 412—427. *V Gröne* made a German version of the *De Antichristo,* Kempten, 1873 (Bibl. der Kirchenväter). Some profound researches on the same book are due to *Fr. C. Overbèck,* Quaestionum Hippolytearum specimen (Dissert. inaug.), Jena, 1864. The fragments of the work «On the Resurrection» are in the Berlin edition, i. 2, 251—254.

5. EXEGETICAL AND HOMILETIC WRITINGS. — Eusebius was acquainted[1] with writings of Hippolytus *εἰς τὴν ἑξαήμερον* and *εἰς τὰ μετὰ τὴν ἑξαήμερον* (probably on Gen. ii—iii). St. Jerome describes them[2] as in *ἑξαήμερον*, in *Exodum*, in *Genesim*, and elsewhere[3] refers to *scholia* of Hippolytus on the Ark of Noah and on Melchisedech. He describes minutely[4] the exposition of Hippolytus on the Blessing of Jacob (Gen. xxvii). The principal remnants of his Genesis Commentaries are copious scholia on the Blessing of Jacob (Gen. xlix), preserved in the Octateuch-Catena of the sophist Procopius of Gaza. There are no fragments extant of Hippolytus on Exodus and Leviticus. Leontius of Byzantium quotes a few lines from Hippolytus on Numb. xxiii or xxiv, under the title *ἐκ τῶν εὐλογιῶν τοῦ Βαλαάμ*, and Theodoret of Cyrus has saved three small fragments *εἰς τὴν ᾠδὴν τὴν μεγάλην*, i. e. on the so-called Canticle of Moses (Deut. xxxii). A late Pentateuch-Catena in Arabic contains both genuine and spurious *scholia* to Genesis, Numbers and Deuteronomy. In 1897 Achelis discovered a Greek fragment «From the exposition of the Book of Ruth» Theodoret of Cyrus quotes four short passages *ἐκ τοῦ λόγου τοῦ εἰς τὸν Ἑλκανᾶν καὶ εἰς τὴν Ἄνναν*. The statue-catalogue mentions a work on the Witch of Endor, *(εἰς ἐγ)γαστρίμυθον*, that is called by St. Jerome[5] *De Saul et Pythonissa*. It seems to be lost. The fragment of the nocturnal scene at Endor published by De Magistris in 1795 under the name of Hippolytus is apparently spurious. The work on the Psalms *(εἰς τοὺς ψ)αλμούς* or *(εἰς ψ)αλμούς* mentioned in the statue-catalogue, and called *De psalmis* by Jerome[6] was only an *opusculum in paucos Psalmos,* as Jerome expressly states elsewhere[7] Theodoret quotes three fragments of Psalm-commentaries: Ps. ii. 7; Ps. xxii. 1 (Septuagint, with a remarkable passage on the sinlessness of Mary) and Ps. xxiii. 7 (Septuagint). Achelis proved in 1897 that all other fragments of Hippolytus-commentaries on the Psalms in Greek and Syriac, as found in the printed editions, are, with the exception of a few insignificant ones, spurious. In the same year Bonwetsch was able to add some Slavonic, Ar-

[1] Hist. eccl., vi. 22. [2] De viris ill., c. 61. [3] Ep. 48, 19; 73, 2.
[4] Ep. 36, 16. [5] De viris ill., c. 61. [6] Ib. [7] Ep. 112, 20.

menian and Syriac fragments to the remnants of the commentary on the Canticle of canticles, *εἰς τὸ ᾆσμα*, mentioned by Eusebius[1] and Jerome[2]. Of the commentary on Proverbs[3] only Catenae-fragments have come down to us; the commentary on Ecclesiastes[4] has apparently perished. Theodoret quotes a passage of Hippolytus on Is. ix, 1 as *ἐκ τοῦ λόγου τοῦ εἰς τὴν ἀρχὴν τοῦ Ἡσαΐου*. There is no evidence to show that Hippolytus wrote a commentary on Jeremias. He did write on Ezechiel, according to Eusebius[5], *εἰς μέρη τοῦ Ἰεζεκιήλ*; at least one Syriac fragment on Ez. i, 5—10 (the Symbols of the Evangelists) must be looked on as genuine. — The best-known and the longest of the exegetical works of Hippolytus is his commentary on the book of Daniel. In 1897 Bonwetsch was able to publish the greater part of it in Greek, and the whole, or nearly the whole of it, in Sclavonic or Old-Sclavonic, together with a German translation. Besides the proto-canonical book of Daniel the commentary treats the story of Susanna and the Hymn of the Three Children in the fiery furnace; in the text of Bonwetsch the narrative of Bel and the Dragon is lacking. The work is divided into four books, was written about 204, after the treatise on Antichrist (iv. 7, 1), and is the oldest of the extant exegetical writings of the Christian Church. His commentary on Zacharias was known to St. Jerome[6] The latter was also acquainted with an Hippolytus-commentary on Matthew[7]; in certain Oriental Catenae (Coptic, Arabic and Ethiopic) there are Hippolytus-scholia to Mt. xxiv. The fragment in Theodoret *ἐκ τοῦ λόγου τοῦ εἰς τὴν τῶν ταλάντων διανομήν* must have been taken from a homily on the parable of the talents (Mt. xxv. 14 ff); similarly the three fragments in Theodoret on the two thieves (*εἰς τοὺς δύο λῃστάς*: Lk. xxiii. 39 ff). An Armenian translation of the homily *in quatriduanum Lazarum II* is found among the spurious works of St. John Chrysostom[8]. The two recensions of this Armenian text, bearing the name of Hippolytus, are taken from «the commentary on the Gospel of John and the resurrection of Lazarus». From later ecclesiastical writers we learn something about the nature of his commentary on the Apocalypse *(de apocalypsi)*[9] particularly from a thirteenth-century Arabic commentary of an unknown author on that book. — Hippolytus was the first Christian writer to compose lengthy commentaries on books of the Old Testament. He does not follow closely the sequence of the biblical narrative, nor dissect the text minutely, it is rather the principal ideas that he selects and discusses in a large and free manner. It is well to recall the fact that his contemporary Origen is likewise a commentator of the Scriptures. But while Origen is intellectually the superior of

[1] Hist. eccl., vi. 22. [2] De viris ill., c. 61. [3] Ib. [4] Ib.
[5] Hist. eccl., vi. 22. [6] De viris ill., c. 61; Comm. in Zach., praef.
[7] Comm. in Matth., praef. [8] *Migne*, PG., lxii. 775—778. [9] *Hier.*, De viris ill., c. 61.

Hippolytus, and a more profound thinker, the latter possesses a fund of exegetic principles more clear and solid than those of Origen. Hippolytus is more sober in his exposition and his principles more like those of the later Antiochene school. He loves, indeed, to allegorize and makes much use of typology. But there is in him a certain moderation; he gives evidence of tact and taste, and of a mind open to the historical view of scriptural things. Many fragments published as remnants of his commentaries have really drifted down from his homilies. A sermon, *De laude Domini Salvatoris,* that he preached in the presence of Origen[1], has perished. From the extant fragments we should judge that the work on Easter *(περὶ τοῦ πάσχα)* mentioned by Eusebius[2] and by St. Jerome[3] was a paschal sermon. The sermon «on the Epiphany», *εἰς τὰ ἅγια θεοφάνεια,* extant complete, both in Greek and Syriac, is full of movement and strength, but is most probably a spurious discourse on baptism.

The best collection of the exegetic and homiletic works and fragments of Hippolytus is found in the first volume of the Berlin edition. We owe to *Bonwetsch* the edition of the commentary on Daniel and the fragments of the commentary on the Canticle of canticles; and to *Achelis* the «minor exegetical and homiletic texts». The Slavonic, Armenian, Syriac and other texts are given in German translation. See *Bonwetsch,* Studien zu den Kommentaren Hippolyts zum Buche Daniel und Hohen Liede, in Texte u. Untersuchungen, Leipzig, 1897, xvi. 2; *Achelis,* Hippolytstudien (ib., Leipzig, 1897, xvi. 4). All the fragments of Daniel known previously to 1877 were published and commented by *O. Bardenhewer,* Des hl. Hippolytus von Rom Kommentar zum Buche Daniel, Freiburg, 1877. In 1885—1886, *B. Georgiades* published in several fascicules of the Ἐκκλησιαστικὴ Ἀλήθεια (Constantinople) the Greek text of the fourth and last book of the commentary on Daniel vii—xii. Cf. *Bonwetsch,* Die handschriftliche Überlieferung des Danielkommentars Hippolyts, in Nachrichten von der k. Gesellsch. der Wissensch. zu Göttingen, Philol.-hist. Klasse (1896), pp. 16—42. For a spurious passage of this commentary (iv. 23, 3) on the date of the Savior's birth (Dec. 25.) see *Bonwetsch,* ib. (1895), pp. 515—527, and the literature referred to there on p. 515. The Greek text of the Slavonic fragment on Apoc. xx. 1—3 (Berlin ed., i. 2, 237 f.) was edited by *Fr. Diekamp,* in Theol. Quartalschr. (1897), lxxix. 604—616, and shown to be spurious. *G. N. Bonwetsch,* Hippolyts Kommentar zum Hohenlied auf Grund von *N. Marrs* Ausgabe des grusinischen Textes herausgegeben, in Texte und Untersuch., new series, Leipzig, 1902, viii. 2. There are in the Codex used by *Marr* other quite unknown, and as yet unedited, Hippolytean texts. *E. Violard,* Etude sur le commentaire d'Hippolyte sur le livre de Daniel (Thèse), Montbéliard, 1903. *Batiffol* holds that Nestorius is the author of the Sermon «On the Epiphany», Revue Biblique (1900), ix. 341—344; *G. Chalatiantz,* Über die armenische Version der Weltchronik des Hippolytus, in Wiener Zeitschr. für d. Kunde d. Morgenl. (1903), pp. 182—186; *G. N. Bonwetsch,* Drei Georgisch erhaltene Schriften von Hippolytus: Der Segen Jakobs, Der Segen Moses', Die Erzählung von David und Goliath (Texte und Untersuchungen, xi. 1), Leipzig, 1904; *O. Bardenhewer,* Neue exegetische Schriften des hl. Hippolytus, in Biblische Zeitschrift (1905), pp. 1—17.

[1] *Hier.,* De viris ill., c. 61. [2] Hist. eccl., vi. 22. [3] De viris ill., c. 61.

6. CHRONOLOGICAL WRITINGS. CANON LAW ODES. — According to Eusebius[1] and St. Jerome[2] a work of Hippolytus, entitled on the statue-catalogue *ἀπόδειξις χρόνων τοῦ πάσχα* contained chronological disquisitions and a paschal cycle of sixteen years beginning with the year 222. The most important relic of this work is visible in the paschal tables for the years 222—233 engraved on either side of the chair in which the figure of Hippolytus is seated. His «Chronicle», called *χρονικῶν* (sc. *βίβλος*?), on the statue-catalogue and very probably identical with the work mentioned in Philosophumena (x. 30), is a compendium of chronology from the creation of the world to 234. Lengthy fragments of it have survived in Greek; it has also reached us in Latin, through three distinct recensions of the so-called *Liber generationis (mundi)*. — From a remark of St. Jerome[3] we may conclude that Hippolytus wrote also on ecclesiastical law and customs. There is no evidence, however, for ascribing to him the authorship of such late collections of apostolic ordinances as the *Constitutiones per Hippolytum*, the Egyptian Church-Ordinance and the *Canones Hippolyti* (§ 75, 6 f). — According to the statue-catalogue he also wrote Odes, *ᾠδαί*, but nothing more is known of them.

The fragments of the work on Easter and the Chronicle are indicated by *Harnack*, Gesch. der altchristl. Lit., i. 625 ff. The different recensions of the *Liber generationis* were edited by *Th. Mommsen*, in Chronica minora saec. iv v vi vii, vol. 1 (Monum. Germ. hist. Auct. antiquiss., ix.), Berlin, 1892, pp. 78 ff.; by *C. Frick*, Chronica minora, vol. 1, Leipzig, 1892, pp. 1 ff.; cf. v. ff. *Frick* maintains that in the *Liber generationis* the Chronicle of Hippolytus is used only as a source, not translated or revised; but his thesis seems untenable. On the Chronicle see *H. Gelzer*, Sextus Julius Africanus, Leipzig, 1885, ii. 1, 1—23; *H. Achelis*, Über Hippolyts Oden und seine Schrift «Zur großen Ode» (§ 54, 5), in Nachrichten von der k. Gesellsch. der Wissensch. zu Göttingen. Philol.-histor. Klasse, 1896, pp. 272—276.

7 SPURIOUS WRITINGS. — Among the writings falsely ascribed to Hippolytus two may be mentioned: the *περὶ τῆς συντελείας τοῦ κόσμου*, compiled from his work on Antichrist (§ 54, 4) and from writings of St. Ephraem Syrus, but not earlier than the ninth century, also a work *κατὰ Βήρωνος καὶ Ἥλικος τῶν αἱρετικῶν περὶ θεολογίας καὶ σαρκώσεως*, written perhaps in the sixth century and surviving only in meagre fragments.

The work *De consummatione mundi* is found in the Berlin edition, i. 2, 289—309. In his Gesammelte Patristische Untersuchungen, Altona, 1889, pp. 56 ff. *J. Dräseke* has undertaken to vindicate for the Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite the authorship of the work against Beron and Helix, but his attempt is unsuccessful.

[1] Hist. eccl., vi. 22. [2] De viris ill., c. 61.
[3] Ep. 71, 6.

8. THE MURATORIAN FRAGMENT. — The Muratorian Fragment, so-called from its discoverer, L. A. Muratori († 1750), and extant in an eighth century codex, is a catalogue of the writings of the New Testament, mutilated at the beginning and perhaps at the end. Intrinsic evidence goes to show that it was composed in the West (Rome?) about the year 200. The very incorrect and difficult Latin text is perhaps a version from the original Greek. Lightfoot attempted, but without success, to claim its authorship for Hippolytus. *Th. Zahn*, Gesch. des neutestamentl. Kanons (1890), ii. 1, 1—143, and *G. Kuhn*, Das Muratorische Fragment, Zürich, 1892, contain the most recent and exhaustive commentaries on this document. For more precise details see the manuals of Introduction to the New Testament, and in particular *Westcott*, On the Canon, Appendix C., 7 ed., 1896, pp. 530 to 547 — A new edition, with a proposed restoration of the Latin text, was brought out by *H. Lietzmann*, Kleine Texte für theolog. Vorlesungen und Übungen, Bonn, 1902; *A. Harnack*, Miscellen, in Texte und Untersuchungen, new series, v. 3, Leipzig, 1900, pp. 107—112.

## § 55. Novatian.

1. HIS LIFE. — The schism of Hippolytus was perhaps forgotten when Novatian[1] began another that was destined to an almost universal extension and a life of centuries, especially in the East. In 250 Novatian was a very distinguished member of the Roman clergy; two of the letters addressed by that body to Cyprian of Carthage[2] after the death of Pope Fabian (Jan. 20., 250) were written by Novatian (§ 51, 5). Both letters represent the praxis of the Roman Church relative to the *lapsi;* the writer and those who commissioned him to write are in full harmony with the opinions of Cyprian. Novatian abandoned the Roman traditions and betrayed his own principles when in 251 he took up at Rome the leadership of a rigorist party in opposition to Pope Cornelius (from March 251), and demanded with them the perpetual exclusion of all apostates from ecclesiastical communion[3]. Concerning his later life and his end nothing certain is known. There are grave reasons for doubting the statement, first met with Socrates[4] that Novatian died a martyr's death in the persecution of Valerian (257—260).

On the schism of Novatian see *v. Hefele*, in Kirchenlexikon, 2. ed., ix. 542—550; *Harnack*, in Realencyklopädie für protest. Theol. und Kirche, 2. ed., x. 652—670. For the Cyprianic epistles 30 and 36 see *Harnack*, in Theol. Abhandlungen, *C. v. Weizsäcker* gewidmet, Freiburg, 1892, pp. 14 to 20. Forged acts of Novatian's martyrdom were current in the sixth century; see Eulogius of Alexandria in *Phot.*, Bibl. Cod. 182 208 280. *W Ammundsen*, Novatianus og Novatianismen etc., Kopenhagen, 1901; *F Torm*, En Kritisk Fremstilling of Novatianus' Liv og Forfattervirksomhed etc., Kopenhagen, 1901; *J. O. Anderson*, Novatian, Kopenhagen, 1901.

[1] The Latin sources usually speak of him as *Novatianus;* the Greeks write mostly *Νοουάτος*, *Ναυάτος*, *Ναβάτος*.

[2] Ep. 30 and 36, ed. *Hartel.* [3] *Socrates*, Hist. eccl., iv. 28. [4] Ib.

2. HIS LITERARY LABORS. — The two letters to Cyprian (§ 55, 1) are quite sufficient to prove the superior ability of Novatian as a rhetorician and a philosopher. It is admitted also by his earliest adversaries, Pope Cornelius[1] and Cyprian[2] Jerome is the first to inform us about his writings: *Scripsit autem de pascha, de sabbato, de circumcisione, de sacerdote, de oratione, de cibis iudaicis, de instantia, de Attalo multaque alia et de trinitate grande volumen, quasi ἐπιτομὴν* operis Tertulliani faciens, quod plerique nescientes Cypriani existimant[3]. The *Epistolae Novatiani* that Jerome mentions elsewhere[4] are perhaps the letters sent by him in 251 to many bishops in order to gain them over to his cause[5]. Only two of the works mentioned by St. Jerome have reached us, *De Trinitate* and *De cibis iudaicis,* though the manuscripts attribute them to Tertullian instead of Novatian. A number of works formerly current under the name of Cyprian have recently been claimed for Novatian. Among them the *De spectaculis* and *De bono pudicitiae* (§ 51, 6 d—e) are rightly adjudged to him; not so, however, *Quod idola dii non sint* (§ 51, 4) and the sermons *De laude martyrii* and *Adversus Iudaeos* (§ 51, 6 a—b). Weyman holds that he is the author of the *Tractatus Origenis de libris SS. Scripturarum,* disovered in 1900.

The *De Trinitate* and *De cibis Iudaicis* were first printed in the edition of Tertullian at Paris in 1545 by *M. Mesnartius* (J. Gangneius). They were also printed, apart from the works of Tertullian, by *E. Welchman,* Oxford, 1724, and *J. Jackson,* London, 1728. The latter edition is reproduced in *Gallandi,* Bibl. vet. Patr., Venice, 1767, iii. 285—323 (cf. xvi to xix), and in *Migne,* PL., iii.861—970.

3. DE TRINITATE. DE CIBIS JUDAICIS. — In contents and form the *De Trinitate* is a work of superior merit. In close adherence to St. Irenæus of Lyons the author treats of God the Omnipotent Father (cc. 1—8), at greater length of the Son, of His divinity, His humanity, and His personal distinction from the Father (cc. 9—28), and very briefly concerning the Holy Ghost (c. 29). Though it was soon afterwards held to be a work either of Tertullian or of Cyprian[6], it certainly came from the hand of Novatian[7], nor is it an extract from the *Adversus Praxeam* of Tertullian[8]. It was probably composed before the outbreak of his schism and even before the persecution of Decius. The *De Cibis Iudaicis* is a work addressed to the Novatian community in Rome, for the purpose of showing how certain foods were declared unclean by the Mosaic law in order to withdraw the Jews from the sins and vices symbolized by those animals. The Christian, however, apart from the precept of temperance, is bound only to

[1] *Eus.,* Hist. eccl., vi. 43. [2] Ep. 55, 16 24.
[3] *Hier.,* De viris ill., c. 70; cf. Ep. 36, 1. [4] Ep. 10, 3.
[5] *Socr.,* Hist. eccl., iv. 28. [6] *Rufin.,* De adult. libr. Orig.
[7] *Hier.,* Contra Ruf., ii. 19. [8] *Hier.,* De viris ill., c. 70.

avoid the use of meats sacrificed to idols. Occasional reminiscences of Seneca are worthy of note. We learn from the writer (c. 1) who, probably because of some persecution by Gallus and Volusianus or by Valerianus, dwelt far from (Rome), that in two former letters he had expressed his opinions on the true circumcision and the true sabbath[1].

For the *De Trinitate* see *H. Hagemann,* Die Römische Kirche und ihr Einfluß auf Disziplin und Dogma, Freiburg, 1864, pp. 371—411 (according to Hagemann the work is not from the pen of Novatian); *J. Quarry,* in Hermathena (1897), no. 23, pp. 36—70, thinks that it is a version from the Greek and that the original was written by Hippolytus; *G. Landgraf* and *C. Weyman,* in Archiv f. latein. Lexikogr. u. Gramm. (1898—1900), xi. 221—249, have given us an excellent edition of *De cibis Iudaicis. Th. M. Wehofer,* Sprachliche Eigentümlichkeiten des klassischen Juristenlateins in Novatians Briefen, in Wiener Studien (1901), xxiii. 269—275.

4. TRACTATUS DE LIBRIS SS. SCRIPTURARUM. — Under the name of Origen twenty homilies have reached us in an Orleans manuscript of the tenth and in another of St. Omer belonging to the twelfth century. Their subject-matter, with the exception of the last (on the miracle of Pentecost, Acts ii), is taken from the Old-Testament. Batiffol, who discovered and edited them, accepted the evidence of the manuscripts; according to him the homilies were really composed or delivered by Origen, and Victorinus of Pettau (§ 58, 1), translated them into Latin, and perhaps revised them. When confronted with the vigorous refutation in the seventeenth homily of Origen's peculiar denial of the resurrection of the body, Batiffol replied that the translator had simply interpolated the text of the original, using for that purpose the *De resurrectione carnis* of Tertullian. Weyman has shown that the Latin text is original and not a version. A close similarity of style and diction suggests Novatian; on the other hand the Trinitarian doctrine of these homilies (ed. *Batiffol,* 33 67 157) seems to indicate a post-Nicene composition. Dom Morin suggests as author the Luciferian Gregory of Eliberis (§ 87, 4).

*Tractatus Origenis de libris SS. Scripturarum detexit et edidit P. Batiffol sociatis curis A. Wilmart,* Paris, 1900; *C. Weyman,* in Archiv für latein. Lexikogr. u. Gramm. (1898—1900), xi. 467 f. 545—576; *G. Morin,* in Revue d'histoire et de littérature relig. (1900), v. 145—161; *Batiffol,* in Bulletin de littérature ecclésiastique (1900), pp. 190—197 (against Morin); 283—297 (against Weyman); *Funk,* in Theol. Quartalschr. (1900), lxxxii. 534—544; *E. C. Butler,* The New Tractatus Origenis, in Journal of Theol. Studies (1901), ii. 113—121 254—262 (*non liquet,* written by an anonymous hand in the fifth or the sixth century); *J. Haussleiter,* Novatians Predigt über die Kundschafter (n. 13) in direkter Überlieferung und in einer Bearbeitung des Cäsarius von Arles, in Neue kirchl. Zeitschrift (1902), xiii. 119—143; *P. Batiffol,* in Civiltà Cattolica, series XVIII (1902), v. 589, is

[1] Cf. the titles De sabbato and De circumcisione, in *Hier.,* De viris ill., c. 70.

now of opinion that it was written by a follower of Novatian towards the end of the persecutions (ca. 300—313). In the Revue Bénédictine (1902), xix, 226—245, *G. Morin* gives up Gregory of Eliberis, but only to look for a still later author, somewhere in the fifth century. *H. Jordan,* Die Theologie der neuentdeckten Predigten Novatians, Greifswald, 1902; *P. Batiffol,* in Revue Biblique (1903), xii. 81—93; *H. Jordan,* Melito und Novitian, in Archiv für latein. Lexikogr. und Grammatik (1902), xii. 59 to 68; *J. Baer,* De operibus Fastidii etc. (cf. § 94, 16); *E. C. Butler,* An Hippolytus-Fragment and a Word on the Tractatus Origenis, in Zeitschrift für die neutestamentl. Wissensch. (1903), iv. 79—87. The so-called Tractatus Origenis, in Journal of Theol. Studies (1905), vi. 587—599.

### § 56. Papal Letters.

1. ST. CALLIXTUS (217—222). — Out of the references in the *De pudicitia* of Tertullian (§ 50, 5) Rolffs undertook, with doubtful success, to restore the text of the penitential or indulgence edict in which Pope Callixtus promised forgiveness and reconciliation to adulterers and fornicators, conditionally on the performance of public penance. It is uncertain whether and to what extent the other decrees of this pope in matters of discipline and dogma (§ 54, 1) were reduced to writing.

*E. Rolffs,* in Texte und Untersuchungen (1893), xi. 3; *P Batiffol,* Le décret de Calliste, in Etudes d'hist. et de théol. positive, Paris, 1902, pp. 69—110.

2. ST. PONTIANUS (230—235). — A Roman synod of 231 or 232 confirmed the decrees of the two Alexandrine synods condemnatory of Origen (*Hier.,* Ep. 33, 4). It is probable that Pope Pontianus communicated the action of the Roman synod in a letter to Bishop Demetrius of Alexandria.

3. ST. FABIANUS (236—250). — This pope wrote a letter (litteris) in approval of the action of a great Numidian synod concerning Privatus, bishop of Lambesa in Numidia[1].

For letters of the Roman clergy during the vacancy of the see from Jan. 250 to March 251 cf. § 51, 5c; § 55, 1.

4. ST. CORNELIUS (251—253). — Amidst the letters of St. Cyprian[2] are two from Cornelius addressed to the former concerning the schism of Novatian. At least five letters of Cornelius to Cyprian are lost[3]. Three letters to Fabius, bishop of Antioch[4], and one to Dionysius, bishop of Alexandria[5], dealt with the same schism, but were certainly written in Greek. Eusebius[6] has saved for us some excerpts from the third letter to Fabius.

*P. Coustant,* Epist. Rom. Pont., Paris, 1721, i. 125—206; *Routh,* Reliquiae sacrae, 2. ed., iii. 11—89. For genuine and spurious material

[1] *Cypr.,* Ep. 59, 10. [2] Ep. 49 50.

[3] *Cypr.,* Ep. 45, 1; 48, 1; 50; 59, 1—2.

[4] *Eus.,* Hist. eccl., vi. 43, 3—4; incorrectly given as *four* letters, in *Hier.,* De viris ill., c. 66.

[5] *Eus.,* l. c., vi. 46, 3. [6] Ib, vi. 43, 5—22.

cf. *Migne,* PL., iii. 675—848; *G. Mercati,* D'alcuni nuovi sussidii per la critica del testo di S. Cipriano, Rome, 1899, pp. 72—86 «Le lettere di S. Cornelio Papa» and (pp. 84—86) a new edition of the same according to important readings of the Verona Codex. It has been mentioned above (§ 51, 6) that L. Nelke holds Cornelius to be the author of *Ad Novatianum.*

5. ST. LUCIUS I. (253—254). — St. Cyprian mentions (Ep. 68, 5) one or more letters of St. Lucius concerning the treatment of those who had apostatized in the persecutions.

6. ST. STEPHEN I. (254—257). — Stephen wrote to the churches in Syria and Arabia[1], also in consequence of the controversy on heretical baptism to the bishop of Asia Minor[2], and to Cyprian[3]. It has been conjectured from passages in Cyprian[4] and Firmilian of Cæsarea[5] that he wrote other letters. We possess only his famous decision on the baptism of heretics in the letter addressed to Cyprian[6] (cf. § 51, 1).

*Coustant,* l. c., i. 209—256; *Harnack,* Gesch. der altchristl. Lit., i. 656—658.

7. ST. SIXTUS II. (257—258). — It is very probable that Sixtus also wrote letters on the question of heretical baptism. Concerning the thesis of *Harnack* that Sixtus is the author of the pseudo-Cyprianic *Ad Novatianum* see § 51, 6 f. In the fourth century a collection of moral apophthegms, translated into Latin by Rufinus of Aquileja, were believed by many to be the work of Pope Sixtus. They are a later adoptation by some Christian of a work of Sextus the Pythagorean (not so *Hier.,* Ep. 33, 3). For recent editions of Rufinus' version see *J. Gildemeister,* Sexti sententiarum recensiones, Bonn, 1873; *A. Elter,* Gnomica, Leipzig, 1892, i. For the other works attributed to Sixtus see *Harnack,* in Texte und Untersuchungen (1895), xiii. 1, 64 f.

8. ST. DIONYSIUS (259—268). — On the subjects of Sabellianism and Subordinationism (Arianism) pope Dionysius addressed two letters to Dionysius of Alexandria[7] (cf. § 40, 3). St. Athanasius has preserved[8] a precious fragment of the first letter, or more properly dogmatic Encyclical. The pope also wrote a letter of consolation to the church of Cæsarea in Cappadocia[9].

*Coustant,* l. c., i. 269—292; *Routh,* l. c., iii. 369—403. Genuine, and spurious material in *Migne,* PL., v. 99—136. For the doctrinal letters to Dionysius of Alexandria see *H. Hagemann,* Die Römische Kirche, Freiburg, 1864, pp. 432—453.

9. ST. FELIX I. (269—274). — The letter of St. Felix to Maximus, bishop of Alexandria, and his clergy, a passage of which was read at the council of Ephesus in 431 (*Mansi,* SS. Concil. Coll., iv. 1188) was very probably the work of an Apollinarist forger.

[1] Dion. Alex., in *Eus.,* Hist. eccl., vii. 5, 2.
[2] Ib., vii. 5, 4; *Cypr.,* Ep. 75, 25.
[3] *Cypr.,* Ep. 74 75.
[4] Ep. 67, 5; 68.
[5] Ib., 75, 25.
[6] Ib., 74, 1.
[7] *Athan.,* Ep. de sent. Dionys., c. 13.
[8] Ep. de decr. Nyc. syn., c. 26.
[9] *Basil. Magn.,* Ep. 70.

*Coustant,* l. c., i. 291—298, defends this fragment as genuine; it is pronounced spurious by *Caspari,* Alte und neue Quellen zur Gesch. des Taufsymbols, Christiania, 1879, pp. 111—123. See *Harnack,* Gesch. der altchristl. Lit., i. 659 f.

10. ST. MILTIADES (311—314). — Either Miltiades, or the Roman synod of Oct. 313, wrote a letter to Constantine concerning the Donatist schism; it is referred to in a letter of the Emperor[1].

## C. OTHER WESTERN WRITERS.

### § 57. Commodian.

1. HIS LIFE. — Only his own works make this writer known to us; even the account of him in Gennadius[2] is taken from his writings. He was brought up as a heathen, but embraced the Christian faith after reading the Scriptures, especially the Old Testament; he had probably been a Jewish proselyte at an earlier date. The eighth-century codex of his *Carmen apologeticum* calls him *sanctus episcopus.* His language shows that he had lived in the Latin West, though he was probably born at Gaza in Palestine[3]. His extant works, it is conjectured, were written about 250 or a little later.

*G. Boissier,* Commodien, Paris, 1886; *Freppel,* Commodien, Arnobe, Lactance, Paris, 1893, pp. 1—27. His two works were edited by *E. Ludwig,* Leipzig, 1877—1878, and *B. Dombart* (1887), Vienna, (Corpus script. eccles. Lat., xv). The preparatory labors of *Dombart* are found in the following reviews: Zeitschr. für wissenschaftl. Theol. (1879), xxii. 374—389; Blätter für das bayer. Gymn.- und Realschulwesen (1880), xvi. 341—351; Sitzungsberichte der phil.-hist. Kl. der k. Akad. der Wissenschaft zu Wien (1880), xcvi. 447—473; (1884), cvii. 713—802. *H. Brewer,* in Zeitschr. für kath. Theol. (1899), xxiii. 759—763, defended a singular opinion concerning the date of the writings of Commodian («about 458 to 466»); *G. S. Ramundo,* in Archivio della Soc. Romana di Storia Patria (1901), xxiv. 373—391, and in Scritti vari di filologia a Ernesto Monaci, Rome, 1902, pp. 215—229 (about the time of Julian the Apostate).

2. INSTRUCTIONES. — The *Instructiones per litteras versuum primas* are a collection in two books of eighty acrostic poems, unequal in length. The first book is written against Jews and heathens, scoffs at the heathen mythologies, reprehends the depraved manners of the heathens and the stubbornness of the Jews, and closes with a threatening reference to the Last Judgment[4] The second book is addressed to the Christians, with the intention of urging all, catechumens and faithful, lay and cleric, poor and rich, to the fulfilling of their duties and the avoidance of sin. The text has come down in a very corrupt condition, the diction is extremely popular, and

[1] *Routh,* Reliquiae sacrae, 2. ed., iv. 297. [2] De viris ill., c. 15.

[3] *Gaseus,* Instr., ii. 39.

[4] In spite of the manuscripts Acrostics 42—45 belong not to the second, but to the first book.

the metre, a very peculiar hexameter, governed alternately by quantity and by accent. All the poems are acrostic (i. 28, is both acrostic and telestic), i. e. the initial letters of the successive verses form words expressive of the theme and the title of the poem. The result of so fantastic a plan was necessarily a stiff and cramped diction, almost wooden in its rigidity His biblical quotations are taken from St. Cyprian's *Testimonia adversus Judaeos*. He seems also to have been acquainted with Minucius Felix, Tertullian, and the «Shepherd» of Hermas.

*Editio princeps,* by *N Rigaltius,* Toul, 1649 (*Migne,* PL., v). For the editions of *Ludwig* and *Dombart* see § 57, 1. *Fr. Hanssen,* De arte metrica Commodiani, in Dissert. philol. Argentorat. sel. (1881), v. 1—90; *W Meyer,* Der Versbau Commodians, in Denkschriften der k. bayer. Akad. der Wissensch., Abhandlungen der philos.-philol. Kl. (1885), xvii. 2, 288 to 307.

3. CARMEN APOLOGETICUM. — Quite similar in its scope to the first book of *Instructiones* is the poem that its original editor entitled *Carmen apologeticum.* It contains 1060 verses, several of which are either fragmentary or illegible, and it is known to us through a single eighth-century manuscript. A prolix introduction (vv. 1—88) is followed by instructions on the nature of God, the beginnings of redemption (89—276), the person of the Savior and the significance of the names of Father and Son (277—578). Then come stern warnings to the heathens (579—616) and to the Jews (617—790). In its closing lines the poem rises to its highest perfection in a formal description of the Last Judgment (791—1060). The author is not mentioned in the codex, but intrinsic evidence points to the author of the *Instructiones.* The mention of the seventh persecution and of the passage of the Danube by the Goths (vv. 808 ff.) suggests the fifth decade of the third century. The metre is that of the *Instructiones,* though the diction, freed from the bonds of the acrostic, is more fluent and lively

The *editio princeps* is that of *J. B. Pitra,* Spicil. Solesm. (1852), i.; cf. (1858), iv. 222—224. It was also edited by *J. H. Rönsch,* in Zeitschr. für die hist. Theol. (1872), xlii. 163—302. For the editions of *Ludwig* and *Dombart* see § 57, 1. *A. Ebert,* Commodians Carmen apol., in Abhandlungen der k. sächs. Gesellsch. der Wissensch. phil.-hist. Kl. (1870), v. 387 to 420; *C. Leimbach,* Über Commodians «Carmen apol. adv. Gentes et Iudaeos» (Progr.), Schmalkalden, 1871; *B. Aubé,* L'Église et l'Etat dans la seconde moitié du III^e^ siècle [249—284], Paris, 1885, pp. 517—544.

4. RETROSPECT. — There is little to attract us in the first Christian poet, from the standpoint of literary form. The verse clings prosaically to the earth; only occasionally, especially in the eschatological parts, does it manifest a certain afflatus and develop a degree of majesty. The contents of his writings betrays a practical and sagacious ecclesiastic, filled with benevolent zeal, but endowed with slight

theological culture. A very gross form of Chiliasm is exhibited in both works[1]. His doctrine on God, on the Trinity, or rather his theodicea, scarcely outlined in the *Instructiones,* appears in the *Carmen apologeticum* (vv. 89 ff. 277 ff. 771 ff.) as downright Monarchianism or Patripassianism.

For the teaching of Commodian on the Trinity see *J. L. Jacobi,* in Zeitschr. für christl. Wissensch. und christl. Leben (1853), iv. 203—209. His eschatology is discussed by *L. Atzberger,* Gesch. der christl. Eschatologie, Freiburg, 1896, pp. 555—566.

### § 58. Victorinus of Pettau and Reticius of Autun.

1. VICTORINUS OF PETTAU. — Victorinus, the earliest exegete of the Latin Church, was bishop of Petabio or Petavio (Pettau in Steiermark) in the closing years of the third century, and died a martyr in the persecution of Diocletian[2]. The statement of Cassiodorus[3] that Victorinus was a rhetorician before he became a bishop, is the result of his confounding our writer with C. Marius Victorinus Afer, a Roman rhetorician of the fourth century. Victorinus of Pettau was probably a Greek by birth[4], though, so far as is known, he wrote only in Latin. He left commentaries on the first three books of the Pentateuch, on Ecclesiastes and the Canticle of canticles, Isaias, Ezechiel and Habacuc, St. Matthew and the Apocalypse, also a work *Adversum omnes haereses*[5]. These works do not exhibit either a cultivated Latin style or extensive erudition[6]. In his exegesis Victorinus is a faithful disciple of Origen, though he gives proof of independence and good judgment[7]. Of his exegetical labors only the commentary on the Apocalypse is known to us, as early as the sixteenth century it was edited in two recensions. Though the shorter recension is the basis of the larger one, it is not itself the original text, but only a revision of the same by St. Jerome. The conclusion of this commentary, repudiated by Jerome because of its decidedly Chiliastic doctrine, was re-discovered in 1895 by Haussleiter. Cave discovered in 1688 a *Tractatus Victorini de fabrica mundi.* It may be the work of our Victorinus, but if so it belongs neither to the commentary on Genesis nor to that on the Apocalypse. The work *Adversum omnes haereses* has been identified, but wrongly, with the *Libellus adversus omnes haereses* printed with the works of Tertullian (§ 50, 8).

*J de Launoy,* De Victorino episc. et mart. diss., Paris, 1653; 2. ed. 1664. Complete editions: *A. Rivinus,* Gotha, 1652; *Gallandi,* Bibl. vet. Patr. (1768), iv. 49—64; *Migne,* PL., v 281—344. The longer recension

[1] *Gennad.,* De viris ill., c. 15. [2] *Hier.,* De viris ill., c. 74.
[3] Instit., i. 5 7. [4] *Hier.,* l. c.
[5] *Hier.,* l. c.; Transl. hom. Orig. in Luc., praef.
[6] *Hier.,* Ep. 58, 10; 70, 5. [7] Ib., 61, 2; 84, 7.

of the commentary on the Apocalypse is in *Gallandi* and *Migne*, also in the Bibliotheca Casinensis (1894), v. 1, Floril. 1—21; the shorter one e. g. in Max. Bibl. vet. Patr., Lyons, 1677, iii. 414—421. On the Chiliastic conclusion see *J. Haussleiter*, in Theol. Literaturblatt (1895), xvi. 193 to 199, and Zeitschr. für kirchl. Wissensch. und kirchl. Leben (1886), vii. 239—257; cf. *Haussleiter*, Der Aufbau der altchristl. Liter., Berlin, 1898, pp. 35—37; Beiträge zur Würdigung der Offenbarung des Johannes und ihres ältesten lateinischen Auslegers Victorinus von Pettau, Greifswald, 1900. For the *De fabrica mundi* with copious *annotationes* cf. *Routh*, Reliquiae sacrae, 2. ed., iii. 451—483. In general see *Preuschen*, in *Harnack*, Gesch. d. altchristl. Liter., i. 731—735. The *De monogrammate* edited by *G. Morin*, in Revue Bénédictine (1903), xx. 225—226, is by some connected with St. Jerome's revision of the commentary on the Apocalypse. *G. Mercati* published from an Ambrosian codex, and annotated, some fragments of a Latin commentary on Mt. xxiv., by an anonymous Chiliast, very probably Victorinus of Pettau. *G. Mercati*, Varia sacra (Studi e Testi 11), Rome, 1903, pp. 3—49; *C. H. Turner*, An Exegetical Fragment of the Third Century, in Journal of Theol. Studies (1904), v. 218; *A. Souter*, The authorship of the Mercati-Turner Anecdoton, in Journal of Theol. Studies (1904), v. 608—621; *Dom G. Morin*, Notes sur Victorin du Pettau, in Journal of Theol. Studies (1906), vii. 456—459.

2. RETICIUS OF AUTUN. — Reticius, in the reign of Constantine bishop of Augustodunum (Autun), the city of the Aedui, was highly esteemed by all his contemporaries in Gaul. He wrote a commentary on the Canticle of canticles and a large work against Novatian[1]. While the diction of the commentary was choice and pleasing, it contained many singular and foolish opinions[2]. It is perhaps in the work against Novatian that St. Augustine found the remark of Reticius on baptism frequently cited by him[3].

Histoire littéraire de la France, Paris, 1733, i. 2, 59—63. Acta SS. Jul., Venice, 1748, iv. 587—589; *Harnack*, Gesch. der altchristl. Liter., i. 751 f.

## APPENDIX.

### § 59. The Acts of the Martyrs.

1. PRELIMINARY REMARK. — Narratives of martyrdom have at all times specially fascinated the hearts of the faithful. It was customary, at a very early date, to celebrate with a liturgical service the anniversary of the martyr's death[4]; it was also customary on such occasions to read to the Christian community a narrative of the events that culminated in so glorious a sacrifice[5] In the first quarter of the fourth century Eusebius made a collection of ancient «Acts of the martyrs» now known to us only by quotations[6]. Those accounts of the earliest Christian martyrdoms which have reached us

[1] *Hier.*, De viris ill., c. 82. [2] *Hier.*, Ep. 37; cf. Ep. 5, 2.
[3] *Aug.*, Contra Iulian, i. 3, 7; Opus imperfectum contra Iulianum, i. 55.
[4] Mart. S. Polyc., c. 18, 3. [5] Acta SS. Perp. et Felic., cc. 1 21.
[6] *Eus.*, Hist. eccl., iv. 15, 47; v., prooem., 2, al.

may be divided into three groups. Some are official documents, records *(acta, gesta)* made by the notaries of the civil court, but handed down in a form calculated to edify the Christian reader. The second group is made up of the narratives of those who saw and heard the details of the martyr's death *(passiones)*. They are lacking in official authenticity, but merit the closest attention of the historian. The third group is composed of accounts of martyrdom, put together at a later period, some of them enlarging partly and partly ornamenting the original story, while others are purely literary figments. We mention here only such very ancient *Acta* as have always been held to be genuine and trustworthy.

The collections of Lives of saints and Acts of martyrs published by *B. Mombritius* (about 1476 at Milan), by *Al. Lipomanus* (1551—1560 at Venice and Rome), and by *L. Surius* (Cologne, 1570—1575, and often since) were all surpassed by the Acta Sanctorum of the Jesuit *J. Bolland* († 1665), and his colleagues known as the Bollandists. This noble enterprise has reached its sixtieth volume, and is not yet complete. Since 1882 it is supplemented by a periodical publication, the Analecta Bollandiana. Cf. Bibliotheca hagiographica graeca seu elenchus vitarum sanctorum graece typis impressarum, edd. *Hagiographi Bollandiani*, Brussels, 1895. Bibliotheca hagiographica latina antiquae et mediae aetatis, edd. *Socii Bollandiani*, Brussels, 1898 ff. (now complete in two volumes and a supplement 1898—1899, 1900—1901). A compendious translation, and a continuation «Les Petits Bollandistes« which is complete (seventeen volumes, with Appendix in three volumes) has been published, Paris, 1888. A critical sifting of the Acts of the martyrs of the first four centuries was undertaken by the Benedictine *Th. Ruinart:* Acta primorum martyrum sincera et selecta, Paris, 1689; 2. ed., Amsterdam, 1713; often reprinted, e. g. Ratisbon, 1859. — *E. Le Blant*, Les Actes des martyrs, in Mémoires de l'Inst. Nat. de France, Acad. des inscriptions et belles-lettres (1883), xxx. 2, 57—347. *K. J. Neumann*, Der römische Staat und die allgmeine Kirche bis auf Diokletian, Leipzig, 1890, i. 274—331 «Zur Kritik der Acta Sanctorum». *Preuschen*, in *Harnack*, Geschichte der altchristl. Literatur, i. 807—834. — *H. Achelis*, Die Martyrologien, ihre Geschichte und ihr Wert (Abhandlungen der kgl. Gesellsch. der Wissensch. zu Göttingen, Berlin, 1900). *O. v. Gebhardt*, Acta martyrum selecta. Ausgewählte Märtyrerakten und andere Urkunden aus der Verfolgungszeit der christlichen Kirche, Berlin, 1902. *R. Knopf*, Ausgewählte Märtyrerakten, Tübingen and Leipzig, 1901 (Sammlung ausgewählter kirchen- und dogmengeschichtlicher Quellenschriften, ed. by *Krüger*, series ii. 2). *H. Leclerq*, Les martyrs. Recueil des pièces authentiques sur les martyrs depuis l'origine du Christianisme jusqu'au xx^e^ siècle, Paris, 1902 to 1904. i—iii. *B. Alasia*, Atti autentici di alcuni santi martiri scelti e tradotti, 2 voll., Torino, 1863.

2. MARTYRIUM S. POLYCARPI. — The oldest Acts that we possess are found in the encyclical letter of the Church of Smyrna concerning the martyrdom, at the age of eighty-six, of its bishop Polycarp. He suffered with other Christians of Smyrna, February 23., 155. The narrative is so straightforward, lively and emotional that there can be no suspicion of forgery. Eusebius incorporated the greater part of it (cc. 8—19, 1) in his Church History (iv. 15). It was composed

before the first anniversary of the death of Polycarp (c. 18, 3). In the manuscripts the original text (cc. 1—20) has been enriched with additions (cc. 21—22) by later hands. An ancient Latin version has also reached us, but is paraphrastic and carelessly executed.

*J. Ussher* was the first to publish the Greek text, London, 1647. It is best edited in the recent editions of the Letter to the Philippians of St. Polycarp by *Zahn*, Leipzig, 1876; *Funk*, Tübingen, 1878 1887 1902 (in the last edition a Jerusalem Codex S. Sepulchri was first used); *Lightfoot*, London, 1885 1889 (cf. § 10, 2), and *v. Gebhardt*, Acta etc. There is also in *Zahn's* edition a new recension of the ancient Latin version; cf. *A. Harnack*, Die Zeit des Ignatius, Leipzig, 1878, pp. 75—90. For the letter itself see *E. Egli*, Altchristliche Studien, Zürich, 1887, pp. 61—79.

3. ACTA SS. CARPI, PAPYLI ET AGATHONICES. — In the reign of Marcus Aurelius (161—180), very probably while Lucius Verus was still his colleague (161—169), Carpus, bishop of Thyatira, and Papylus, deacon of Thyatira (?), were condemned to the stake, after a steadfast confession of their faith. A Christian woman, Agathonice, who stood by, threw herself voluntarily into the flames. The narrative is very simple and touching, and was evidently composed by an eye-witness. It is also mentioned by Eusebius[1] A longer recension that goes back to Simeon Metaphrastes in the tenth century wrongly places the martyrdom in the time of Decius.

The longer recension is in *Migne*, PG., cxv. 105—126. The original text was first published by *B. Aubé* from a twelfth-century (?) manuscript, in Revue archéologique, new series (1881), xlii. 348—360, and again in l'Eglise et l'Etat dans la seconde moitié du III^e^ siècle, Paris, 1885, pp. 499 to 506. A new edition of the same manuscript with commentary by *Harnack* is to be found in Texte und Untersuchungen (1888), iii. 3—4 433—466; and another edition was made by *v. Gebhardt*, Acta etc.

4. ACTA SS. JUSTINI ET SOCIORUM. — Between 163 and 167 the Apologist Justin and six other Christians were cast into prison at Rome, because of their Christian faith, by order of Junius Rusticus, prefect of the City; they were scourged and beheaded. Apart from the beginning and the end, these brief acts, apparently unknown to Eusebius, are a copy of the official records.

The Greek text was first published in the Acta Sanctorum Jun., Antwerp, 1695, Venice, 1741, i. 20—21; later among the works of Justin, in *Migne*, PG., vi. 1565—1572; cf. 1795 f., and better in *v. Otto*, Corpus apol. christ., Jena, 1879, iii. 3, 266—279; cf. xlvi—l; also in *v. Gebhardt*, Acta etc. *P. Franchi de' Cavalieri*, Note agiografiche. I: Gli Atti del martirio di S. Ariadne. II: Gli Atti di S. Giustino, in Studi e Testi, Rome, 1902, viii.

5. EPISTOLA ECCLESIARUM VIENNENSIS ET LUGDUNENSIS. — In the seventeenth year of Marcus Aurelius (177—178) the Christian

[1] *Eus.*, Hist. eccl., iv. 15, 48.

community of Lyons was tried by a severe persecution [1]. When its fury had been spent, the Christians of Lyons and Vienne sent to the brethren in Asia Minor a minute and picturesque narrative of the terrible events they had survived. Lengthy fragments, all too brief to satisfy our curiosity, have been saved for us in the Church History of Eusebius (v. 1—4).

These fragments may also be found in *Routh,* Reliquiae sacrae, 2. ed., Oxford, 1846, i. 293—371, and in *v. Gebhardt*, Acta etc. — *O. Hirschfeld,* Zur Geschichte des Christentums in Lugdunum vor Konstantin, in Sitzungsberichte der kgl. preussischen Akad. der Wissensch. zu Berlin, 1895, 381—409.

6. ACTA MARTYRUM SCILITANORUM. — The first fruits of the martyrs of Africa were twelve men and women of Scili in Numidia. They appeared before the proconsul, P Vigellius Saturninus, at Carthage July 17., 180, and were condemned as Christians to die by decapitation. Their Acts have reached us in three Latin and one Greek recension. The shortest of the Latin texts offers the substance of the court-records of the trial, while the other two give evidence of later changes and additions. The Greek text is a version of the Latin.

For the three Latin recensions cf. *Ruinart,* l. c. (§ 59, 1), 2. ed., pp. 84 to 89, the shortest and oldest one is given there in fragmentary condition. *H. Usener* first published the Greek text, in Index Schol. Bonn. per menses aest. a. 1881. All previously (to 1881) known texts are printed by *B. Aubé,* Etude sur un nouveau texte des Actes des martyrs Scillitains, Paris, 1881. The shortest and oldest Latin text is found complete, in Analecta Bolland. (1889), viii. 5—8; cf. (1897), xvi. 64 f. A complete collection of all relative texts is given by *J. A. Robinson,* in Texts and Studies (1891), i. 2, 104—121, also in *v. Gebhardt,* Acta etc. Cf. *Neumann,* l. c. (see § 59, 1), i. 71—74 284—286; *Zahn,* Gesch. des neutestamentl. Kanons (1892), ii. 2, 992—997.

7 ACTA S. APOLLONII. — Eusebius relates in his Church History (v. 21) that during the reign of Commodus (180—192) a highly cultured and esteemed Christian of Rome, named Apollonius, was beheaded after an eloquent defence of his faith before the *praefectus praetorio* Perennis (180—185) and the Roman Senate. It was easy to recognize mere conjecture in the additional details given by St. Jerome [2]. Very doubtful, in particular, seemed the statement that Apollonius had read before the Senate an excellent work *(insigne volumen)* in defence of his faith. It was therefore a matter of general surprise when Conybeare discovered (1893) an Armenian text of the «Martyrdom of S. Apollonius the Ascetic». Shortly after the Bollandists made known a Greek text of the «Martyrdom of the holy and celebrated apostle Apollos» (sic). Both texts contain the Acts of Apollonius as known to Eusebius, though more or less disfigured by later changes and additions. Given the actual state of the Acts,

[1] Ib., v., prooem., 1. [2] De viris ill., c. 42 53; Ep. 70, 4.

it is not easy to unravel with clearness the course of the trial, nor to discern the role which fell to the Senate. The *ἀπολογία* referred to by Eusebius must have been made up of the questions of the judge Perennis and the replies of Apollonius. The martyr outlines broadly the teachings of Christian faith and morality. His exposition is remarkable for its firmness and dignity as well as for the candor of mind and the tranquillity of spirit that it reveals.

The Armenian «Martyrium» is found in the Armenian collection of the Acts of the Martyrs published at Venice in 1874 by the *Mechitarists* (i. 138—143). *F C. Conybeare* published an English version in The Guardian, June 18., 1893, and again in his «Apology and Acts of Apollonius and other monuments of early Christianity, London, 1894; 2. ed. 1896. A German version by *Burchardi* was communicated by *Harnack* in Sitzungsberichte der kgl. preussischen Akad. der Wissensch. zu Berlin, 1893, pp. 721—746. The Bollandists published the Greek text of the «Martyrium» from a cod. Paris. (saec. xi vel xii), in Anal. Bolland. (1895), xiv. 284—294. *E. Th. Klette* published a new edition (with a German version from the same Greek codex, together with *Burchardi's* translation of the Armenian text, in Texte und Untersuchungen (1897), xv. 2, 91 ff.; *Max Prinz von Sachsen,* Der heilige Märtyrer Apollonius von Rom, historisch-kritische Studie, Mainz, 1903; *R. Seeberg,* in Neue kirchl. Zeitschr. (1893), iv. 836 to 872; *Th. Mommsen,* in Sitzungsber., Berlin, 1894, pp. 497—503; *A. Hilgenfeld,* in Zeitschr. für wissenschaftl. Theol. (1894), xxxvii. 58—91; (1898), xli. 185—250; *R. Seeberg,* in Theol. Literaturblatt (1900), xxi. 225 f.; *J. Geffcken,* Die Acta Apollonii, in Nachrichten von der kgl. Gesellsch. der Wissensch. in Gött., phil.-hist. Kl. (1904), iii. *v. Gebhardt* gives in his «Acta» the Greek text and the version of Burchardi.

8. ACTA SS. PERPETUAE ET FELICITATIS. — On March 7., 202 or 203, probably at Carthage in Roman Africa and not at Thuburbo, five catechumens died for their faith. They were Vibia Perpetua, a youthful matron of good social standing, Saturninus and Saturus, and two slaves Felicitas and Revocatus. With the aid of the autograph notes left by St. Perpetua and St. Saturus an eye-witness composed a forcible and animated narrative of their martyrdom that has always been looked on as the pearl of this species of literature. We possess, in addition to the original Latin, the text of an ancient Greek version; a second, considerably shorter, Latin text is notably a later excerpt, probably taken from the Greek version. While it is true that the author or editor of these Acts belonged to the party of the Montanists (cc. 1 21) and was probably none other than Tertullian[1], there is no evidence to show that the martyrs themselves were Montanists. As late as the fifth century these Acts where still read at Hippo on the anniversary of the martyrs, *in natali martyrum Perpetuae et Felicitatis*[2]

For the original Latin text see *Ruinart,* l. c., 2. ed., pp. 90—119; *Migne,* PL., iii. 13—60; cf. pp. 61—170. The shorter Latin text was

[1] *Tert.,* De anima, c. 55. [2] *Aug.,* Serm. 280—282.

edited by *B. Aubé,* in 1881; the ancient Greek version by *J. R. Harris* and *S. K. Gifford,* in 1890. A good edition of all three texts is that of *J. A. Robinson,* The Passion of St. Perpetua, Cambridge, 1901, in Texts and Studies, i. 2. Equally good is the edition of the two longer texts by *P. Franchi de' Cavalieri*, Passio Ss. Perpetuae et Felicitatis, Rome, 1896 (Römische Quartalschr., Supplement 5). In the introduction to this study *Franchi* has exhibited the evidence in favor of the priority of Latin text. *A. Pillet,* Les martyrs d'Afrique Histoire de S. Perpétue et de ses compagnons, Paris, 1885; *Neumann*, l. c., i. 171—176 299 f. Cf. *v. Gebhardt's* «Acta» for both Greek and Latin texts.

9. ACTA S. PIONII. — Eusebius[1] has left us an account of the martyrdom of St. Pionius and other Christians at Smyrna. The narrative has reached us in various recensions. While Eusebius places their martyrdom in the time of the Antonines, and more particularly in the reign of Marcus Aurelius, the Acts in their present state indicate, with every appearance of truth, the year 250 and the reign of Decius.

They were published by Ruinart, 2. ed., pp. 137—151, from an ancient Latin version. The Greek text was made known by *O. v. Gebhardt* from a cod. Ven. Marc. 359, in Archiv für slavische Philologie (1896), xviii. 156—171, and in his «Acta». He has also promised a larger edition of this text with the Latin, Slavonic and Armenian versions. *B. Aubé,* l'Eglise et l'Etat dans la seconde moitié du III^e^ siècle, Paris, 1885, pp. 140 to 154. *Zahn,* Forschungen zur Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons (1891), iv. 271 f. *J. A. F. Gregg,* The Decian Persecution, Edinburgh, 1897, pp. 242—261 264—266.

10. ACTA DISPUTATIONIS S. ACHATII. — Achatius (Acacius), probably bishop of Antioch in Phrygia, but not to be confounded with Acacius, bishop of Melitene in Asia Minor, underwent an interesting interrogatory before the consular magistrate Marcianus; after examining the records of which Decius allowed him to go free.

The Latin text of the official records is in *Ruinart,* 2. ed., pp. 152 to 155. It is certainly a version from the Greek; cf. *Aubé,* l. c. pp. 181 to 194, and the «Acta» of *Gebhardt.*

[1] Hist. eccl., iv. 15, 46—47.

SECOND PERIOD.

# FROM THE BEGINNING OF THE FOURTH TO THE MIDDLE OF THE FIFTH CENTURY

## FIRST SECTION.

## GREEK WRITERS.

### § 60. General conspectus.

1. THE CHANGE IN THE EXTERNAL CONDITION OF THE CHURCH. — The edict of toleration issued by the Augusti in January or February of 313 restored peace to the Christian Church. At the same time it was only a lame attempt at concealing the complete overthrow of the heathen state; there could be but one step more from toleration to frank preference of Christianity In 337 Constantine received the baptism that he had long put off. His sons assumed at once a hostile attitude towards heathenism. Julian the Apostate (361—363) attempted to infuse new life into the moribund polytheism, but his efforts only made more manifest the incompatibility between the old religion and the exigencies of the new times. In 392 the worship of the gods was declared high treason (crimen maiestatis)[1]; and as early as 423 heathenism was looked on in the East as defunct[2].

During the campaign against the Persians in which he met his death, Julian wrote three books against the Galilæans, κατὰ Γαλιλαίων, of which only some fragments remain. The work began with the words: «I hold it proper for me to expose to all men the motives which have persuaded me that the mendacious teaching of the Galilæans is a malicious invention of men.» Most of the extant fragments are found in the first book of the (only partially preserved) work of St. Cyril of Alexandria against Julian (§ 77, 3). They have been carefully collected by *K. J. Neumann*, Scriptorum graecorum qui christianam impugnaverunt religionem quae supersunt, fasc. III, Leipzig, 1880. The same writer has also translated them into German Kaiser Julians Bücher gegen die Christen, Leipzig, 1880. Cf. *P. Klimek*, Coniectanea in Iulianum et Cyrilli Alexandrini contra illum libros (Dissert. inaug.), Breslau, 1883; *Th. Gollwitzer*, Observationes criticae in Iuliani imperatoris contra Christianos libros (Dissert. inaug.), Erlangen, 1886. For a new but small fragment see *Neumann*, in Theol. Literaturzeitung (1899), pp. 298—304; *G. Negri*, L'imperatore Giuliano

[1] Cod. *Theodos.*, xvi. 10, 12. [2] Ib., xvi. 10, 22.

l'Apostata. Studio storico, Milano, 1901; *P. Allard,* Julien et les Chrétiens: la persécution et la polémique (third and last volume of his Julien l'Apostat), Paris, 1902.

2. DEVELOPMENT OF ECCLESIASTICAL DOCTRINE. — Though the Church was now free from external oppression, she suffered all the more from domestic enemies. Both in the East and the West she was obliged to defend the purity of her faith against the attacks of heresy. It is the development and determination of ecclesiastical doctrine that lend to this epoch its distinctive character. To the East particularly falls the special task of abstract crystallization and speculative illustration of theological truths in their strict significance. During a first period which closes with the Second Ecumenical Council of Constantinople (381) the true divinity and the perfect humanity of the Redeemer are established against Arianism, Macedonianism, Sabellianism and Apollinarianism. In the second period which ends with the fourth Ecumenical Council of Chalcedon (451) the relation of the human and the divine in the God-Man is rigorously defined to mean that the two natures are united in one person, but without confusion and without change.

For the literary history of Arianism, Macedonianism, Sabellianism and Apollinarianism cf. § 61.

3. THEOLOGICAL SCHOOLS AND TENDENCIES. — Under these circumstances ecclesiastical science grew with great rapidity. A general peace offered favorable opportunities for its free and varied development, while the conflict with heresy opened new sources of intellectual growth. Within the limits of ecclesiastical theology schools and tendencies arose that assumed more definite outlines than in earlier times, and through assertion of their special characteristics soon became quite opposed one to another. It is quite easy to distinguish at once three such tendencies. The Neo-Alexandrine school, having freed itself from the subordinationist errors of Origen in his Trinitarian teaching, continues to follow, along new paths, the impulse of its great master. It aims at a speculative knowledge of the truths already grasped by faith, but acknowledges expressly that the Pistis (Faith) is the immovable norm of all true Gnosis (Knowledge). The head of this new school is Athanasius; its most brilliant disciples are the three Cappadocians: Basil the Great, Gregory of Nazianzus, and Gregory of Nyssa. It is true that Gregory of Nyssa defends the Origenistic Apocatastasis, while somewhat later Didymus the Blind and Evagrius Ponticus, also Origenists, maintained both the pre-existence of souls and the Apocatastasis; both were condemned. Synesius of Cyrene can become a Christian bishop, yet remains a Hellene «from the tip of his toe to the crown of his head». Cyril, the bishop of Alexandria, becomes heir to both the office and the influence of an Athanasius. The Antiochene school

continues to oppose the main tendency of the Alexandrine, and by reason of its activity in the interpretation of Scripture is known as the exegetical school. It beholds in the allegorical interpretation of the Scripture, as taught with predilection by the Alexandrine, the deadly enemy of all sane exegesis and it lays great stress on an objective, i. e. historico-grammatical, rendering of the text. It follows with apprehensive criticism the flight of Alexandrine speculation. Instead of depth and warmth of sentiment the Antiochene offers an extremely sober intellectual attitude, quite hostile to all extravagance of thought. The founder of this school is the martyr Lucian (§ 44, 3), the teacher of Arius. Its best-known representatives are Diodorus of Tarsus, St. John Chrysostom, Theodore of Mopsuestia, Polychronius, and Theodoret of Cyrus. By reason of their rationalizing tendencies, most of them, particularly Theodore of Mopsuestia, came into conflict with the traditional teachings of the Church. Precisely at the height of its fame (370—450) almost the entire school was Nestorian in doctrine. Indeed, the struggle between Cyril of Alexandria and Nestorius was really the hostile embrace of the Alexandrine and Antiochene tendencies. Another intellectual movement is traceable in the fourth century and may be described as an excessive Traditionalism. It is first tangible in the Anti-Origenistic troubles, and later on rejected all scientific knowledge and criticism. As early as the third century some writers, notably Methodius of Tyre, had protested with justice against certain theses of Origen. However the fourth-century reaction against that master's influence, as headed by Epiphanius, was more a matter of personal interests than of ecclesiastical and scientific opposition, and not unfrequently made use of very unworthy means These Origenistic controversies are the first herald of the crisis on which Greek theology was entering — after the middle of the fifth century its vitality begins to ebb and weaken.

*C. Hornung,* Schola Antiochena de S. Scripturae interpretatione quonam modo sit merita, Neustadt, 1864; *H. Kihn,* Die Bedeutung der antiochenischen Schule auf dem exegetischen Gebiete, nebst einer Abhandlung über die ältesten christlichen Schulen, Weissenburg, 1866; *Ph. Hergenröther* Die antiochenische Schule und ihre Bedeutung auf exegetischem Gebiete Würzburg, 1866.

4. ECCLESIASTICAL LITERATURE. — During this period ecclesiastical literature reaches its highest standard of perfection. In almost every department a tireless activity reigns, fields hitherto unworked are now cultivated with zeal. — *Apologetics.* Apologetic literature conforms to the changed conditions and assumes a new character. It was usually only in self-defence that the earlier apologists had made positive attacks on heathenism, henceforth all the apologies for Christianity take up a polemical attitude. The defenders of the new religion against the attacks of Julian are Gregory of Nazianzus, John

Chrysostom, Cyril of Alexandria, and Philippus Sidetes; against the writings of Porphyrius, Eusebius of Cæsarea, the younger Apollinaris and Macarius Magnes, Eusebius also enters the arena against Hierocles (or rather Philostratus). The apologies with more general tendency of Eusebius, Athanasius and Theodoretus are of use rather in attack than in defence. Specially anti-Jewish works were composed by Gregory of Nyssa (?), Diodorus of Tarsus, and John Chrysostom. Numerous champions arose against the rapid and widespread growth of the system of the Persian Mani († about 277), which propagated under a Christian garb ideas that were essentially Persian dualism, with its two kingdoms of light and darkness and their corresponding series of aeons. — *Polemics and Systematic Theology.* The doctrinal writings are mostly occupied with the burning questions of the time, and are usually strictly polemical in character. In the fourth century the principal opponents of heresy are Eusebius of Cæsarea, Athanasius, the three Cappadocians (Gregory of Nazianzus, Basil the Great, and Gregory of Nyssa), Didymus the Blind and Epiphanius; in the fifth century Cyril of Alexandria and Theodoret of Cyrus are most prominent. The «Epitome of Divine Teachings», *θείων δογμάτων ἐπιτομή*, added by Theodoret to his «Compendium of Heretical Fables» is a noteworthy attempt at a systematic theology. Special points of doctrine were treated in a markedly positive manner by Cyril of Jerusalem, Gregory of Nyssa, and Epiphanius. — *Biblical Theology.* No attention was paid to textual criticism. Epiphanius alone was acquainted with Hebrew; he also made remarkable progress in the department of introductory sciences or biblical antiquities, though it had been cultivated before him by Eusebius of Cæsarea. Gregory of Nyssa undertook occasionally to illustrate and defend the hermeneutical principles of the Neo-Alexandrines, while Diodorus of Tarsus and Theodore of Mopsuestia upheld the principles of the Antiochene school. The work of Adrianus, entitled «Introduction to the Sacred Scriptures», may be considered as an Antiochene manual of Hermeneutics. In Christian circles, outside of Antioch and its territory, the allegorizing method maintained its supremacy, and was represented by such men as Eusebius of Cæsarea, Athanasius, Gregory of Nyssa, Didymus the Blind, and Cyril of Alexandria. On the other hand, the writers of the Antiochene school were remarkable for their literary productiveness; the commentaries of Theodoret of Cyrus exhibit the highest degree of perfection, both in form and contents, although the homilies of John Chrysostom are not inferior as specimens of exegetical skill. — *Historical Theology.* Church History, unknown to the first three centuries, reached a very high standard. The creator of this science is Eusebius of Cæsarea. His labors were continued by Socrates, Sozomen and Theodoret. The Eunomian Philostorgius wrote a history of the Church, in the interests of Arianism.

Other ecclesiastical histories written in this period have been lost, e. g. those of Philippus Sidetes, Hesychius of Jerusalem, Timotheus of Berytus and Sabinus of Heraclea. The latter's work was the first known history of the Councils. Histories of heresy were published by Epiphanius and Theodoret. — *Practical Theology.* The asceticomoral literature of the time was the outcome of Christian monasticism whose institutions appeared first in Egypt, and were then transplanted into Palestine by Hilarion, whence Basil the Great brought them to Asia Minor. Ascetical manuals for ecclesiastics, more particularly for monks, were written by Basil the Great, Gregory of Nazianzus, and Chrysostom. To a similar purpose we owe the Life of Saint Anthony by Athanasius, and the collections of monastic biographies by Timotheus of Alexandria and Palladius. Cyril of Jerusalem was a brilliant catechetical expounder, and John Chrysostom a homilist and preacher of great renown. The so-called Apostolic Constitutions, that undertake to regulate the whole course of Christian and ecclesiastical life, belong to the beginning of the fifth century, and were probably the work of Syrian Apollinarists.

5. ECCLESIASTICAL LITERATURE (CONTINUED). POETRY. — Similarly, in poetry and song the Church enters upon a rivalry with the dying heathenism of the period, though in this department of literature the Greek Church failed to keep pace with the Syrian and the Latin Churches. Arius attempted, indeed, to render his heresy popular by means of folk-songs. The elder and the younger Apollinaris of Laodicea, Nonnus (?), and the Empress Eudocia, attempted with doubtful success to cast Christian thought into the forms of antique poetry. Pre-eminent as Christian poets during the fourth century were Gregory of Nazianzus and Synesius of Cyrene, both of whom were habitually faithful to the laws of antique metre, though in Gregory we meet already new forms of literary art, destined to awaken, by the use of nobler harmonies, a more universal echo in the heart of the people. Henceforth rhythmic verse, with its accentuation of certain words, tends to suppress the antique quantitative metre.

### § 61. Arianism, Macedonianism, Sabellianism, Apollinarianism.

1. ARIANISM. — We possess very insufficient knowledge of the Christology of the martyr Lucian (§ 44, 3); it was, however, decidedly subordinationist, and was the basis on which Arius, a presbyter of Alexandria († 336), began to teach that the Logos or Son of God was a creature of God (*κτίσμα, ποίημα*), called into being out of nothing (*ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων*), before the creation of the world, by a free act of divine will, in order to serve God as instrument for the creation of the other beings. The Son did not always exist (*οὐκ ἀεὶ ἦν ὁ υἱός*); there was a time when he was not (*ἦν ποτε ὅτε οὐκ ἦν*); before he was created he was nothing; like all other creatures

he too had a beginning by creation *(οὐκ ἦν πρὶν γένηται, ἀλλ' ἀρχὴν τοῦ κτίζεσθαι ἔσχε καὶ αὐτός)*[1]. The Son is, therefore, by nature entirely distinct from the Father *(ὁ λόγος ἀλλότριος μὲν καὶ ἀνόμοιος κατὰ πάντα τῆς τοῦ πατρὸς οὐσίας καὶ ἰδιότητός ἐστιν*[2]*; ξένος τοῦ υἱοῦ κατ' οὐσίαν ὁ πατήρ, ὅτι ἄναρχος ὑπάρχει)*[3]. He is called the Son of God in the same sense as men are called the children of God, and if the Scriptures say he was begotten, that «begetting» is identical with the creative act. The second creature of God, after the Logos, is the Holy Spirit; only the Father is true God. — The first ecumenical Council at Nicæa (325) condemned the teaching of Arius and declared that the Son of God was of the same nature or substance with the Father *(τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ ὁμοούσιον τῷ πατρί)*. It was only after long conflicts, in which the very existence of the Church was apparently at stake, that the decision of the Council was universally accepted. The chief literary champions of Arianism were the sophist Asterius († about 330?), the Antiochene deacon Aëtius († about 370), the bishops Acacius of Cæsarea († 366) and Eunomius of Cyzicus († about 395). Catholic orthodoxy was represented principally by Athanasius, and the three Cappadocians: Basil the Great, Gregory of Nazianzus, and Gregory of Nyssa.

Some fragments of the writings of Arius under the title of «A Banquet» (θάλεια) are preserved in the writings of Athanasius (Orat. c. *Arian.*, i. 2—10; De synodis, c. 15). There are also letters of Arius to Eusebius, bishop of Nicomedia (*Theodoret.*, Hist. eccl., i. 4), to Alexander, bishop of Alexandria (*Athan.*, De synodis, c. 16; *Epiph.*, Haer. 69, 7), and a profession of faith (*Socrates*, Hist. eccl., i. 26; *Sozomenus*, Hist. eccl., ii. 27). According to Athanasius the «Banquet» contained also poetical passages. Philostorgius says (Hist. eccl., ii. 2) that Arius wrote «songs for sailors and millers and travellers, and other similar chants», destined to spread his teachings among the people. See (Cardinal) *Newman's* History of the Arians. *Le Bachelet*, Arianisme, Dict. de la Théol., Paris, 1903, i. 1779—1863. *Eusebius of Nicomedia* († 341 or 342), the «Syllucianist» or fellow-disciple of Arius in the school of Lucian (see the end of Arius' letter to Eusebius), defended at once in a series of letters the views of his school-mate. One letter, that to Paulinus of Tyre, has reached us through Theodoret (Hist. eccl., i. 5); a fragment of a letter to Arius has come down through Athanasius (De synodis, c. 17), where there are also excerpts from letters written to Arius by other friends. The sophist and «Syllucianist» *Asterius* wrote in defence of Arius; fragments of his writings are quoted by Athanasius (Orat. c. *Arian.*, i. 32; ii. 37; iii. 2; De synodis, cc. 18—19, and elsewhere). Many other writings of this sophist have perished (*scripsit in Epistolam ad Romanos et in Evangelia et Psalmos commentarios et multa alia*, says *St. Jerome*, De viris ill., c. 94). For further details of the life of Asterius cf. *Th. Zahn*, Marcellus von Ancyra, Gotha, 1867, pp. 38 ff. A little work of *Aëtius* has been preserved by Epiphanius (Haer. 76, 11); it defends in 47 theses the motto of the Arians ἀνόμοιος (sc. ὁ υἱὸς τῷ πατρί). *Acacius of Cæsarea* defended his fellow-heretic Asterius against an attack of Marcellus, bishop of Ancyra

[1] *Arius*, Thalia, in *Athan.*, Orat. c. Arian., i. 5.
[2] *Athan.*, Orat. c. Arian., i. 6. [3] *Athan.*, De synodis, c. 15.

(§ 61, 3); fragments of this apology may be seen in Epiphanius (Haer. 72, 6—10). There is also a Semiarian confession of faith laid by Acacius before the Synod of Seleucia in 359 (*Epiph.*, Haer. 73, 25). Many other of the writings of Acacius have disappeared (*Hier.*, De viris ill., c. 98; *Socrates*, Hist. eccl., ii. 4). In imitation of the sophistical dialectic of Aëtius, his disciple *Eunomius* called theology «a technology» (τεχνολογίαν, *Theod.*, Haer. fab., iv. 3). We still have a work of Eunomius, entitled Ἀπολογητικός, composed about 360, to which Basil the Great wrote an answer (*Migne*, PG., xxx. 835—868 among the works of Basil the Great; cf. *Goldhorn*, S. Basilii opera dogm. sel., Leipzig, 1854, pp. 580—615). In the work of Gregory of Nyssa against Eunomius (cf. *Rettberg*, Marcelliana, Göttingen, 1794, pp. 125—147) some brief fragments are preserved of the counter-reply of Eunomius entitled ὑπὲρ τῆς ἀπολογίας ἀπολογία, written probably in 378, as an answer to the work of St. Basil. For a formal profession of faith made by Eunomius before the Emperor Theodosius, about 381 or 383, and severely criticised by Gregory of Nyssa in the second book of his work against Eunomius, see *Rettberg*, l. c., pp. 149 to 169, and *Goldhorn*, l. c., pp. 618—629. We know only the title of a commentary by Eunomius on the Epistle to the Romans, mentioned by Socrates (Hist. eccl., iv, 7); there existed once a collection of forty letters of Eunomius mentioned by Photius (Bibl. Cod. 138). Eunomius was not so much an advanced disciple of Arianism as a logical student and teacher of its consequences; cf. *C. R. W Klosse*, Geschichte und Lehre des Eunomius, Kiel, 1833; *Fr. Diekamp*, Die Gotteslehre des hl. Gregor von Nyssa, Münster, 1896, i. 122 ff; *Mason*, The Five Theological Orations of Saint Gregory of Nazianzus (the first four are against Eunomius), Cambridge, 1899. Fragments of a Commentary on Isaias written by the Arian bishop *Theodore of Heraclea* († about 355), were published by *Mai* (*Migne*, PG., xviii. 1307—1378). St. Jerome mentions (Ep. 112, 20) commentaries of Theodore on the Psalms and (Comm. in Matth., praef.) on the Gospel of Matthew. *Batiffol* has shown that the Arians were very active in distributing the acts of their martyrs and biographies of their prominent members: *P. Batiffol*, Etudes d'hagiographie arienne. La passion de S. Lucien d'Antioche, in Compte Rendu du congrès scientif. internat. des Catholiques, 1891, 2. section, pp. 181—186; *Id.*, Etudes d'hagiographie arienne: Parthénius de Lampsaque, in Röm. Quartalschr. für christl. Altertumskunde u. für Kirchengesch. (1892), vi. 35—51; cf. ib. (1893), vii. 298—301; *Id.*, Un historiographe anonyme arien du 4. siècle, ib. (1895), ix. 57—97. On the Ecclesiastical History of the Eunomian Philostorgius see § 79, 2.

2. MACEDONIANISM. — During the main struggle between Catholic orthodoxy and Arianism, divergent doctrines were being taught among the Arians themselves. The Semiarians rejected the *ἀνόμοιος* of the extreme Arians, and put in its place, some an *ὅμοιος*, some an *ὁμοιούσιος*. Nevertheless, whenever the former drew near to the Catholic doctrine *(ὁμοούσιος)* concerning the Son of God, they fell away proportionately by insisting that the nature of the Holy Spirit was a created and not a divine nature; hence they were known as Pneumatomachi. It was Macedonius, bishop of Constantinople († after 360), the esteemed head of the Semiarians of Thrace, who maintained that the Holy Spirit was a being subordinate to the Father and the Son, a creature like the angels. The Second Ecumenical Council (Con-

stantinople, 381) condemned Macedonius and proclaimed the divinity of the Holy Spirit (*τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον τὸ σὺν πατρὶ καὶ υἱῷ συμπροσκυνούμενον καὶ συνδοξαζόμενον*). Throughout this controversy Athanasius, the three Cappadocians, and Didymus the Blind were the theological defenders of the traditional faith of the Church.

It is not known whether Macedonius left any writings. Among the writers of his party are *Eusebius of Emesa* († ca. 359), *Basil of Ancyra* († after 360), and *George of Laodicea* († after 360). The greater part of the works of Eusebius of Emesa, declared «*innumerabiles*» by St. Jerome (De viris ill., c. 91) have perished. The Greek homilies and fragments collected by *Augusti:* Eusebii Emeseni quae supersunt opuscula graeca, ad fidem codd. Vindobonensium et editionum diligenter expressa et adnotationibus hist. et phil. illustrata ab *I. Chr. G. Augusti,* Elberfeld, 1829 (cf. *Migne,* PG., lxxxvi. 1, 463 ff.), belong to Eusebius of Alexandria, Eusebius of Cæsarea and others: see *J. C. Thilo,* Über die Schriften des Eusebius von Alexandrien und des Eusebius von Emesa, Halle, 1832.

Two large collections of Latin homilies were formerly attributed without reason to Eusebius of Emesa: a) Homiliae 56 ad populum et monachos, in reality the work of various ecclesiastical writers of Gaul (Hilarius of Arles, Faustus of Reji, Cæsarius of Arles), first collected, apparently, by Eusebius Bruno, bishop of Angers († 1081). They are printed in Max. Bibl. vet. Patr., Lyons, 1677, vi. 618—675. b) Homiliae 145 (or rather 142) in evangelia festosque dies totius anni, taken, and for the most part verbally, from the gospel-commentary of Bruno of Segni († 1123). They are in *Migne* PL., clxv 747—864, among the works of Bruno of Segni. Cf. for these two collections of homilies *Feßler-Jungmann,* Institt. Patrol., ii. 1, 3—4, and for more details concerning the first collection § 111, 2—3. On the other hand, of the fourteen *opuscula* or homilies extant in Latin only and published by J. Sirmond (1643), under the name of Eusebius of Cæsarea (*Migne,* PG., xxiv. 1047—1208), at least the first two (De fide adversus Sabellium, i. e. against Marcellus of Ancyra, cf. § 61, 3) are the work of Eusebius of Emesa. A still unedited discourse «On resting from labor on the Lord's Day» that Zahn inclines to consider the work of Eusebius of Emesa, is printed by *Zahn,* in Skizzen aus dem Leben der alten Kirche, Erlangen, 1894, pp. 278—286. Basil of Ancyra and George of Laodicea were joint authors, in the name of their party, of a doctrinal memorial that Epiphanius has preserved (Haer. 73, 12—22). Other works of Basil of Ancyra have perished (*Hier.,* De viris ill., c. 89); cf. *J. Schladebach,* Basilius von Ancyra (Inaug.-Diss.), Leipzig, 1898; *F. Cavallera,* Le «De virginitate» de Basile d'Ancyre, in Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique (1905), pp. 5—15. The works of George of Laodicea have also perished; cf. *J. Dräseke,* Gesammelte patristische Untersuchungen, Altona, 1889, pp. 14—24. On the ecclesiastical history of the Macedonian Sabinus of Heraclea see § 79, 2.

3. SABELLIANISM. — In order to emphasize more forcibly the unity of nature of the Father and of the Son, Marcellus, bishop of Ancyra in Galatia († ca. 374), went so far as to suppress the distinction of persons in the divine nature. According to him the Logos is the eternal indwelling power of God, which manifests itself in creation of the world as operative power (*ἐνέργεια δραστική*), and dwells in Christ for the purpose of redeeming and perfecting the

human race. This God-Man is called and is Son of God. The Logos is not begotten; before the Incarnation there was no Son of God. Because of its affinity with the modalistic Monarchianism of the presbyter Sabellius (first half of the third century) this teaching of Marcellus was known in the East as Sabellianism. Owing to the opposition of Eusebius of Cæsarea and Athanasius it met with but few adherents.

In his *Contra Marcellum* and *De ecclesiastica theologia* Eusebius of Cæsarea has preserved some fragments of the work of Marcellus *De subiectione Domini Christi* (περὶ τῆς τοῦ υἱοῦ ὑποταγῆς; cf. 1 Cor. xv. 28) written against the Arian Asterius (§ 61, 1). Epiphanius quotes (Haer. 72) a letter of Marcellus to Pope Julius of the year 337 or 338 and the already (§ 61, 1) mentioned fragments of the work of Acacius against Marcellus, also a profession of faith made by the followers of Marcellus. Other writings of Marcellus, unknown to us, are mentioned by St. Jerome (De viris ill., c. 86). All that remains is to be found in *Chr. H. G. Rettberg,* Marcelliana, Göttingen, 1794; the so-called *Legatio Eugenii diaconi ad S. Athanasium pro causa Marcelli* is in *Migne,* PG., xviii. 1301—1306. *C. R. W Klose,* Geschichte und Lehre des Marcellus und Photinus, Hamburg, 1837; *Fr. A. Willenborg,* Über die Orthodoxie des Marcellus von Ancyra, Münster, 1859; *Th. Zahn,* Marcellus von Ancyra, Gotha, 1867; *Fr Loofs,* Die Trinitätslehre Marcells von Ancyra und ihr Verhältnis zur älteren Tradition, Sitzungsberichte der k. preuß. Akad. der Wissensch., Berlin, 1902. — *Photinus,* bishop of Sirmium († ca. 376), was an Asiatic like Marcellus, and his disciple. Taking for granted that there was in God but one person, he taught that our Lord was a man miraculously born, who had attained the divine dignity by reason of his high moral development. The numerous Greek and Latin writings of Photinus (*Hier.,* De viris ill., c. 107; *Vinc. Lerin.,* Commonit., c. 16) have all perished; cf. *Zahn,* l. c., p. 189 ff.

4. APOLLINARIANISM. — Apollinaris, bishop of Laodicea in Syria († ca. 390), believed that the true divinity of the Redeemer could be saved only by the sacrifice of his perfect humanity; otherwise the union of true divinity and perfect humanity would lead to the admission of two Sons of God, one by nature and the other by adoption because, he says, two beings, perfect in themselves, can never unite in one being (*δύο τέλεια ἓν γενέσθαι οὐ δύναται*)[1]. Moreover, a perfect humanity would include a human will, and therefore the possibility of sin on the part of the Redeemer (*ὅπου γὰρ τέλειος ἄνθρωπος, ἐκεῖ καὶ ἁμαρτία*)[2] The Son of God did really assume a living flesh (*σάρξ*), an animated body, but it was the divinity itself that took the place of the human *νοῦς* or of the human *πνεῦμα*. This doctrine was opposed among others by St. Gregory of Nazianzus, St. Gregory of Nyssa, and in particular by St. Athanasius, or the author (or authors) of the two books against Apollinaris that appear among the works of St. Athanasius. The Second Ecumenical Council (Constantinople, 381), condemned (in its first canon) the heresy of the Apollinarists. Apollinaris was

[1] *Athan.,* Contra Apoll., i. 2. [2] Ib.

one of the most fertile and versatile ecclesiastical writers of his day. He was primarily an exegete, and according to St. Jerome[1] wrote countless volumes on the Holy Scriptures. The fragments of his writings are scattered through many Catenae, where they await collection and critical study. There is extant[2] a complete paraphrase of the Psalms in hexameters, richly interwoven with reminiscences of the old Hellenic poets. Precisely for that reason the peculiar color and spirit of the ancient Hebrew chants are lost. There is so far no good reason for admitting the hypothesis of Dräseke that the famous metrical paraphrase of St. John's Gospel[3] written about the end of the fourth century and attributed to the famous heathen poet Nonnus of Panopolis, is really the work of Apollinaris. His Father, the elder Apollinaris, a priest of Laodicea, had already attempted to clothe the Christian Scriptures in the garb of antique Hellenic poetry, but none of his works have reached us. Both father and son entertained the hope that by such labors they would be able to compensate the Christians for the loss of the heathen classics and to win over the heathens to the religion of Christ. Also the thirty books of the younger Apollinaris against the Neoplatonist Porphyry († ca. 304) that merited special praise from St. Jerome[4] have not reached us. Other works not mentioned by Jerome, relating to the Trinity and to Christology, seemed also lost, with the exception of some fragments especially from his «Demonstration of the Incarnation of God in the image of Man» *(ἀπόδειξις περὶ τῆς θείας σαρκώσεως τῆς καθ' ὁμοίωσιν ἀνθρώπου)*, that appear in the refutation of this work by St. Gregory of Nyssa (see § 69, 3). It is worthy of note that Leontius of Byzantium or the author of *Adversus fraudes Apollinaristarum*[5] maintained that Apollinarists and Monophysites had put in circulation certain writings of Apollinaris *(τινὲς τῶν Ἀπολιναρίου λόγων)* under the authoritative names of SS. Gregorius Thaumaturgus, Athanasius, and Julius (of Rome). The researches of Caspari (1879) have made it certain that the work *ἡ κατὰ μέρος πίστις* that went under the name of Gregorius Thaumaturgus (§ 47, 5) is really a work of Apollinaris. The profession of faith *περὶ τῆς σαρκώσεως τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου*, attributed to Athanasius (§ 63, 3), is also very probably from the pen of Apollinaris. Similarly several letters were sent abroad under the name of Pope Julius I. (§ 63, 14) that were very probably written by Apollinaris or one of his earliest disciples. Dräseke claims for Apollinaris a number of other works, namely the *Cohortatio ad Gentiles* and the *Expositio fidei*, printed among the works of St. Justin Martyr (§ 17, 5—6), also three homilies ascribed to Gregory Thaumaturgus (§ 47, 5), the fourth and fifth books of St. Basil's work

[1] De viris ill., c. 104. [2] *Migne*, PG., xxxiii. 1313—1538.
[3] Ib., xliii. 749—1228. [4] *Hier.*, De viris ill., c. 104.
[5] *Migne*, PG., lxxxvi. 2, 1948.

against Eunomius (§ 67, 4), and the first three of the seven dialogues *De Trinitate* current under the name of Theodoret of Cyrus (§ 78, 8). The arguments of Dräseke are very general and would probably collapse after a serious study of any one of these works

*J. Dräseke,* Apollinarios von Laodicea. Sein Leben und seine Schriften. Nebst einem Anhang· Apollinarii Laodiceni quae supersunt dogmatica (Texte und Untersuchungen), Leipzig, 1892, vii. 3—4. This work includes the results of many special researches published in preceding years. The appendix contains a correct reprint from former editions of Antirrheticus contra Eunomium (= *Pseudo-Basilius M.*, Adv. Eun., iv—v), Dialogi de S. Trinitate (= *Pseudo-Theodoretus,* Dialogi de Trinitate, i—iii), De Trinitate (= *Pseudo-Justinus M.*, Expositio fidei), Fidei expositio (= *Pseudo-Gregorius Thaumat.*, ἡ κατὰ μέρος πίστις), De divina incarnatione libri fragmenta, and many smaller remnants. *A. Spasskij* has reached quite opposite conclusions in his (Russian) work on Apollinarios of Laodicea, Sergiev, 1895; see the remarks of *Bonwetsch,* in Byzant. Zeitschr. (1897), vi. 175—177 For exegetical fragments on Proverbs, Ezechiel and Isaias, attributed to Apollinaris, see *A. Mai,* Nova Patr. Bibl., Rome, 1854, vii. part. 2, 76—80 82—91 128—130. Specimens of a critical edition of the paraphrase of the Psalms mentioned above were published by *A. Ludwich,* Königsberg, Psalms 1—3 (1880, Progr.), 4—8 (1881, Progr.). The very extensive interpolation of the text may be traced back to the noted forger *Jacob Diassorinos* († 1563). See *A. Ludwich,* in Byzant. Zeitschr. (1892), i. 292—301; *J. Dräseke,* Die Abfassungszeit der Psalmen-Paraphrase des Apollinarios von Laodicea, in Zeitschr. für wissenschaftl. Theol. (1889), xxxii. 108—120. *Id.,* Zu Apollinarios von Laodicea, «Ermunterungsschrift an die Hellenen», in Zeitschr. f. wissenschaftl. Theol. (1903), xlvi. 407—433. For new editions of the paraphrase of the Gospel of Saint John, usually attributed to Nonnus of Panopolis, we are indebted to *Fr. Passow,* Leipzig, 1834, and *A. Scheindler,* Leipzig, 1881 (in both the text of the Gospel is included). *Janssen,* Das Johannesevangelium nach der Paraphrase des Nonnus Panopolitanus, mit einem ausführlichen kritischen Apparat, Leipzig, 1903, in Texte und Untersuchungen, viii. 4. The hypothesis of the authorship of Apollinaris was put forward by *Dräseke,* in Theol. Literaturzeitung (1891), p. 332, and in Wochenschrift für klass. Philol. (1893), p. 349. On the merit of this hypothesis, the character of the paraphrase and the most recent literature, cf. *Bardenhewer,* art. *Nonnus,* in *Wetzer* and *Welte,* Kirchenlexikon, 2. ed., also *G. Voisin,* L'Apollinarisme, Paris, 1901; cf. *Id.,* Revue d'hist. eccl. (1902), iii. 33—55 239—252; *J. Flemming* and *H. Lietzmann,* Apollinaristische Schriften, syrisch mit den griechischen Texten und einem syrisch-griechischen Wortregister, in Abhhandl. der k. Gesellsch. der Wissensch. zu Göttingen (1904). We have lost the Profession of faith of *Vitalis,* bishop of Antioch, one of the earliest and most active of the disciples of Apollinaris. It is mentioned by St. Gregory of Nazianzus (Ep. 102, ad Cledon.).

After the death of their master the Apollinarists divided into two parties, the followers of *Polemon* (or *Polemius*) and those of *Valentinus;* cf. *J. C. L. Gieseler,* Commentat. qua Monophysitarum veterum variae de Christi persona opiniones illustrantur partic. II (Progr.), Göttingen, 1838, pp. 18—21, where the extant fragments of Polemon's writings are found (pp. 18—20). The author of the Adv. fraudes Apollinaristarum (*Migne,* PG., lxxxvi. 2, 1948—1969) has saved a few fragments of the writings of Valentinus, the adversary of Polemon, and of those of his disciple and follower,

Timotheus, bishop of Berytus; cf. *Fr. Loofs,* Leontius von Byzanz, Leipzig, 1887, pp. 84 ff. For the Ecclesiastical History of Leontius see § 79, 2. Valentinus quotes the Christological profession of faith of an Apollinarist bishop Job (*Migne,* l. c., 1952 3320; cf. *Caspari,* Alte und neue Quellen zur Geschichte des Taufsymbols, Christiania, 1879, p. 24). The forger of the letters of St. Ignatius of Antioch, in all probability identical with the compiler of the Apostolic Constitutions, leaves no doubt as to his Apollinarian tenets (§ 9, 1). *H. Lietzmann,* Apollinaris von Laodicea und seine Schule, Tübingen, 1904.

### § 62. Eusebius of Cæsarea.

1. HIS LIFE. — The golden age of patristic literature opens with the splendid productions of Eusebius Pamphili, bishop of Cæsarea in Palestine (ca. 265 to ca. 340). This land was at once his home and the scene of his literary activity. It was in Cæsarea, which later became his episcopal see, that he received his intellectual training. In this city he enjoyed for many years the society of the learned priest Pamphilus, whose name he assumed as a token of veneration and gratitude; hence he was known as Eusebius Pamphili, i. e. the spiritual son of Pamphilus. When the latter was thrown into prison during the persecution of Maximinus Daza, Eusebius accompanied him and worked with him at an Apology for Origen (§ 45, 1). In 309 Pamphilus died as martyr; at a later date Eusebius honored his memory by a biography in three books (§ 45, 1). He escaped further dangers in the persecution by his flight from Cæsarea to Tyre, and thence into Egypt. Here he was seized and imprisoned, but it is uncertain how long he suffered as a witness to the Christian faith. At the close of the persecution he returned to Cæsarea, probably in 313, became its bishop, and a very influential one, for he enjoyed in a special degree the favor of Constantine. His defects are henceforth no less manifest than his good qualities: we behold in him a lack of personal independence and of clearness in his doctrinal ideas, that very seriously affect his work as a Christian bishop. He does not grasp the importance and drift of the controversy about the Trinity. He is constantly in the field as a peace-maker, with suggestions of mutual concessions on the basis of a recognition of the true divinity of the Redeemer in simply biblical terms. He believed that the Homoousian doctrine of Athanasius led logically to Sabellianism; this phantom was ever before his eyes and was the motive which drew him ever more deeply within the orbit of Arianism. At the Council of Nicæa (325) he sought to take up a conciliatory attitude, but at the express wish of the Emperor signed the profession of faith drawn up by the Council. It is significant, however, that the term ὁμοούσιος never occurs in his writings, not even in those composed after the Council of Nicæa. He held communion with the Arians and may have influenced the imperial measures against the orthodox bishops. He certainly took a prominent part in the

Council of Antioch (330) which deposed Eustathius, bishop of that city and an active opponent of Arianism, he was also a member of the Synod of Tyre (335) that meted out a similar treatment to Athanasius, the head of the orthodox party More than once Eusebius composed public laudations of Constantine. On the occasion of the Emperor's «tricennalia» or thirtieth anniversary of the assumption of the reins of government (July 25., 335), he delivered a panegyric on Constantine *(εἰς Κωνσταντίνον τὸν βασιλέα τριακονταετηρικός)*[1]. When the emperor died (May 22., 337) he dedicated to his memory a lengthy eulogium remarkable for declamation rather than for genuine eloquence *(εἰς τὸν Κωνσταντίνου τοῦ βασιλέως βίον λόγοι δ')*[2].

2. HISTORICAL WORKS. — Among his numerous writings none have received such unqualified approval, dating from his own time, as the great historical works known as the «Chronicle» and the «Ecclesiastical History». They have earned for him such titles as the «Christian Herodotus» and «Father of Church History» The Chronicle[3] bears the name of «Divers Histories» *(παντοδαπὴ ἱστορία)* and is divided into two parts: the *χρονογραφία* and the *κανὼν χρονικός*. He says in the preface that it is his purpose to furnish an ethnographic chronology based on the historical monuments of the nations (I. part), and then to attempt (II. part) a synchronistic co-ordination and concordance of these historical data. Before him Julius Africanus had attempted to harmonize the historical traditions of the Gentiles and the Jews (§ 43, 2); it is to the credit of Eusebius that he accomplished this task and that his calculations were accepted as successful. Throughout his work runs the dominant idea of a close relation between the most remote history and the history of his own time; the influence that these views of Eusebius exercised on all later historiography is simply incalculable. Eusebius wrote this work for Orientals, but St. Jerome transplanted to the West the historical ideas of the «Chronicle», by translating the 2. part of it into Latin, and continued it to 379 (a. Abr. 2395; cf. § 93, 6) i. e. he added fifty-four years to the historical text of Eusebius, who had stopped at 325 (a. Abr. 2341). The first part of the Chronicle was unknown to us until the publication of the Armenian version. The Greek text of both parts has perished, save for some fragments.

In its first edition the Ecclesiastical History of Eusebius *(ἐκκλησιαστικὴ ἱστορία)*[4] described the vicissitudes of the Church from its foundation to the victories of Constantine over Maxentius (October 28., 312), and of Licinius over Maximinus Daza (April 30., 313), both of which victories are treated by Eusebius as the triumph of Christianity over paganism. These victories are the subject of the last chapter in the

[1] *Migne,* PG., XX. 1315—1540. [2] Ib., XX. 905—1230.
[3] Ib., XIX. [4] Ib., XX.

ninth book of the History, and the concluding words are evidently written as a suitable ending to the whole work. At a later date Eusebius added a tenth book, which brings the history of the Church down to the defeat of Licinius (July 3., 323) i. e. to the sole rulership of Constantine. The Ecclesiastical History is a very rich collection of historical facts, documents, and excerpts from a multitude of writings belonging to the golden youth of the Christian Church. The value of these materials is beyond all calculation, although the text in which they are incorporated, can lay claim neither to completeness of narrative nor to an evenly distributed treatment of events, much less to an orderly and genetic exposition of its store of historical information. On the other hand, it is a «source-book» in the fullest sense of the word. Eusebius has been reproached with deliberate falsification of facts, but the reproach cannot be proved, although here and there his personal feelings of favor or of dislike may have influenced his judgment or hindered breadth of view. We owe to Rufinus (§ 92, 3) a Latin paraphrase of the Church History It is easier to defend the historical value of this work than that of the statements concerning Constantine (see § 62, 1) wherein he has been often reproached with intentional alteration of the facts of history. In them Eusebius is less a historian than a panegyrist, who now palliates and now exaggerates. In opposition to contemporary pagan writers he aims at setting in a clear light the Christian and ecclesiastical sentiments of the emperor. — We have lost a collection of ancient Acts of the martyrs compiled by Eusebius (§ 59, 1); on the other hand, we possess still a little work written by him on the contemporary martyrs of Palestine. It has reached us in two recensions: a shorter one in Greek, usually printed as an appendix to the eighth book of the Church History, and a longer one, the complete text of which is extant only in a Syriac version.

3. EXEGETICAL WORKS. — Besides his superior gifts as a historian Eusebius possessed a great aptitude for exegetical studies. He is lacking, however, in sound and clear hermeneutical principles; it is substantially the manner and method of Origen that predominate in his exegetical writings. He must have written continuous commentaries on an entire series of biblical books. The commentary on the Psalms edited by Montfaucon[1] had numerous gaps, and ends with Psalm 118. Mai discovered in several Catenae fragments of the commentary on the following Psalms[2], Pitra was able to add other remnants of the commentary on preceding Psalms which show Eusebius to have been a plagiarist of Origen. The greater part of the commentary on Isaiah[3] has been saved, in it he promises an historical exposition but often ends in arbitrary allegorism. Of his commentaries on New Testament

[1] Ib., xxiii. [2] Ib., xxiv. 9—76. [3] Ib., xxiv. 89—526.

books very considerable fragments have reached us, chiefly of those on the Gospel of Saint Luke[1] Other works of Eusebius may be described as introductory to the study of the Bible. Thus, he wrote a kind of Gospel Harmony[2] which makes evident in ten tables those statements of the Four Gospels which are common to all, to three, or to two — or which are found only in one Gospel, also Biblical Questions and Answers *(περὶ τῶν ἐν εὐαγγελίοις ζητημάτων καὶ λύσεων)*[3] concerning the Gospels, extant only in excerpts and fragments. They undertake to reconcile apparent antilogies in the Gospels, such as affect the genealogies of the Savior, His burial, resurrection, etc. Of more importance is a (fragmentary) alphabetical list of the place-names of the Old Testament, with description and name of each site as it was in his day (*περὶ τῶν τοπικῶν ὀνομάτων τῶν ἐν τῇ θείᾳ γραφῇ*, not printed in Migne). Eusebius constructed it from an ancient topography of Palestine and Jerusalem; Jerome translated it into Latin and added to its contents (§ 93, 5). Only a fragment has reached us of his work «On Easter» *(περὶ τῆς τοῦ πάσχα ἑορτῆς)*[4], written on occasion of the discussions at the Council of Nicaea (325) concerning the feast, and well-known because of its beautiful testimony to the holy sacrifice of the Mass.

4. APOLOGETIC WORKS. — He took up his pen on many occasions, and always with success, in defence of the Christian religion and against paganism. The chief characteristic of his apologetical writings is the vastness of their historical erudition. The Evangelical Preparation *(εὐαγγελικὴ προπαρασκευή)*[5] in fifteen books demonstrates the incomparable superiority of Christianity, and even of Judaism, over all the religious and philosophical systems of the heathens. The Evangelical Demonstration (*εὐαγγελικὴ ἀπόδειξις*) expounds in twenty books the thesis that Christianity is the divine development of Judaism, only ten books of this work have reached us[6]. He drew up a compact abridgment of these two large works in the five books of a treatise «On the appearance of God among men» *(περὶ τῆς θεοφανείας)*. Its Greek text is extant only in fragments[7]. Quite similar must have been the work entitled «A general elementary Introduction» *(ἡ καθόλου στοιχειώδης εἰσαγωγή)*. Almost the only extant fragments of it are the four books of his «Prophetic sayings» *(ἐκλογαὶ προφητικαί)*[8], in which he expounds the Messianic prophecies of the Old Testament. His large work against Porphyry († ca. 304) in twenty-nine or thirty books, twenty of which were known to Saint Jerome[9], has perished. His little work against Hierocles, procurator of Bithynia (ca. 303), is a critique of the portrait of Apollonius

[1] *Migne*, PG., xxiv. 529—606. [2] Ib., xxii. 1275—1292.
[3] Ib., xxii. 879—1016. [4] Ib., xxiv. 693—706. [5] Ib., xxi.
[6] Ib., xxii. 13—794. [7] Ib., xxiv. 609—690. [8] Ib., xxii. 1021—1262.
[9] *Hier.*, De viris ill., c. 81.

of Tyana as drawn by Philostratus. Hierocles had plagiarized in order to establish a parallel between Apollonius and Christ *(πρὸς τὰ ὑπὸ Φιλοστράτου εἰς Ἀπολλώνιον τὸν Τυανέα διὰ τὴν Ἱεροκλεῖ παραληφθεῖσαν αὐτοῦ τε καὶ τοῦ Χριστοῦ σύγκρισιν)*[1]. Eusebius shows with sarcastic acumen that the true source of the work of Hierocles was the highly idealized portrait of the Neo-Pythagorean and magician Apollonius, or merely fables and legends put together by Flavius Philostratus; in particular, the alleged miracles of Apollonius were either forgeries of the historian or demoniac imitations of the miracles of Christ.

5. DOCTRINAL WRITINGS. LETTERS. HOMILIES. — Two of his doctrinal works belong to the history of Arianism. In the two books «Against Marcellus» *(κατὰ Μαρκέλλου)*[2] he undertakes to prove that Marcellus of Ancyra (§ 61, 3) was justly deposed by the Arians at the Council of Constantinople (336), on account of the identity of his Trinitarian teaching with Sabellianism which was condemned in the third century. The three books of his work On ecclesiastical theology *(περὶ τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς θεολογίας)*[3] are an exposition and defence of the true doctrine of the Logos. Socrates[4] and Theodoret[5] have preserved for us a letter of Eusebius to the people of his diocese in which he explains his attitude at Nicæa and the meaning of *ὁμοούσιος*. Nicephorus of Constantinople († 826) inserted in his *Antirrhetica* and criticised sharply the principal passages of a letter of Eusebius to Constantia, the sister of Constantine, in which he speaks in a hostile sense concerning portraits of Christ. Of the fourteen homilies, extant only in Latin, and attributed to him[6], some, at least, are certainly not from his pen.

6. COLLECTED WORKS OF EUSEBIUS. TRANSLATIONS. LITERATURE ON EUSEBIUS. — The manuscript-tradition of the writings of Eusebius is described by *Preuschen,* in *Harnack,* Gesch. der altchristl. Lit., i. 551—586. The only complete edition or reprint of the works of Eusebius is that by *Migne,* PG., xix—xxiv. A handy edition of some of his writings is that by *W. Dindorf:* Praepar. evang., Demonstr. evang., Hist. eccl., Leipzig, 1867—1871, 4 vols.; cf. *A. C. Headlam,* The Editions and Mss. of Eusebius, i., in Journal of Theolog. Studies (1902), iii. 93—102. Nearly all the works of Eusebius were translated into Syriac, many of them also into Armenian. Selected works have appeared in German versions, e. g. *M. Stigloher* (Church History, Martyrs of Palestine), Kempten, 1870, and *J. Molzberger* (Life of Constantine), ib., 1880 (Bibl. d. Kirchenväter). An English version of the Church History, with a commentary, was edited by *McGiffert,* and one of the two works on Constantine by *E. Richardson,* in Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church, ser. II, New York, 1890, i. *Fabricius,* Bibl. Gr. ed. Harles, vii. 335—518: De Eusebio Caesareensi et aliis historiae ecclesiasticae atque chronicorum scriptoribus graecis. *F. J. Stein,* Eusebius, Bischof von Cäsarea, nach seinem Leben, seinen Schriften und seinem dogmatischen Charakter, Würz-

[1] *Migne,* PG., xxii. 795—868. [2] Ib., xxiv. 707—826.
[3] Ib., xxiv. 825—1046. [4] Hist. eccl., i. 8. [5] Hist. eccl., i. 11.
[6] *Migne,* PG., xxiv. 1047—1208.

burg, 1859; *Salmon,* in Dictionary of Christian Biography, London, 1880, ii. 308—355: Eusebius of Cæsarea; *Van den Gheyn,* S. J., in Vigouroux, Dictionnaire de la Bible, Paris, 1899, ii. 2051—2056: Eusèbe.

7 SEPARATE EDITIONS AND SPECIAL RESEARCHES. — Historical writings. Eusebii Pamph. Caes. episc. Chronicon bipartitum nunc primum ex armeniaco textu in latinum conversum, adnotationibus auctum, graecis fragmentis exornatum, opera *P. I. B. Aucher,* Venice, 1818, 2 vols. Eusebi Chronicorum libri duo. Edidit *Alfred Schoene,* Berlin, 1866—1875, 2 vols. Eusebi Chronicorum liber prior. Ed. *A. Schoene.* Armeniacam versionem latine factam ad libros manuscriptos recensuit *H. Petermann.* Graeca fragmenta collegit et recognovit, appendices chronologicas sex adiecit *A. Schoene,* 1875. (Eusebi Chronicorum Canonum quae supersunt ed. *A. Schoene.* Armeniacam versionem latine factam e libris manuscr. rec. *H. Petermann.* Hieronymi versionem e libris manuscr. rec. *A. Schoene.* Syriam epitomen latine factam e libro Londinensi rec. *E. Roediger,* 1866.) Eusebii Canonum epitome ex Dionysii Telmaharenis Chronico (syriace) petita, sociata opera verterunt notisque illustrarunt *C. Siegfried* et *H. Gelzer,* Leipzig, 1884. Cf. *A. v. Gutschmid,* Untersuchungen über die syrische Epitome der Eusebischen Canones (Progr.), Stuttgart, 1886 (*A. v. Gutschmid,* Kleine Schriften, herausgegeben von *Fr. Rühl,* Leipzig, 1889, i. 483—529); *A. Schoene,* Die Weltchronik des Eusebius in ihrer Bearbeitung durch Hieronymus, Berlin, 1900; *C. H. Turner,* The Early Episcopal Lists, i. The Chronicle of Eusebius, in Journal of Theol. Studies (1900), i. 181—200; *H. Montzaka,* Die Quellen zu den assyrisch-babylonischen Nachrichten in Eusebius Chronik, in Beiträge zur alten Geschichte (1902), pp. 351—405.

The *editio princeps* of the Church History and of the two works on Constantine (with the continuations of the Church History of Socrates, Sozomen, Theodoret, Evagrius, Philostorgius, Theodorus Lector) was issued, by commission from the French episcopate, by Henri de Valois (Valesius, † 1676), Paris, 1659—1673, and again in 1677, 3 vols. It was reprinted at Frankfort, 1672—1679, and Amsterdam, 1695; *W. Reading* published an improved edition at Cambridge, 1720, 3 vols. New recensions of the text of the Church History have been made by *F. A. Heinichen,* Leipzig, 1827 to 1828, 3 vols.; *E. Burton,* Oxford, 1838, 2 vols; *H. Laemmer,* Schaffhausen, 1859—1862, 6 fasc. In 1830 *Heinichen* edited the two works on Constantine and in 1840 (on the appearance of *Burton's* edition) he added *Supplementa* to his own edition of the Church History. The Latin paraphrase of Rufinus was edited anew by *Th. Mommsen,* in the Griechische christliche Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte, Eusebius, Leipzig, 1903, ii. 1 (Book i—v); cf. *A. Harnack,* in Berlin. Sitzungsberichte (1903), pp. 300—307. There are also handy editions of the Church History by *A. Schwegler,* Tübingen, 1852, and *W. Dindorf,* Leipzig, 1871 (§ 62, 6). One to form part of Nizzini's «Bibliotheca Sanctorum Patrum» is announced. A very old Syriac version of the Church History was published by *P. Bedjan,* Leipzig, 1897, also by *W. Wright* and *N. McLean,* Cambridge, 1898; *E. Nestle,* Die Kirchengeschichte des Eusebius, aus dem Syrischen ins Deutsche übersetzt, in Texte und Untersuchungen, new series, Leipzig, 1901, vi. 2; *Id.,* in Zeitschrift d. d. Morgenl. Gesellsch. (1902), lvi. 335—564. A fifth-century Armenian version from the Syriac was published at Venice, 1877. Eusebius' Kirchengeschichte, Buch VI und VII. Aus dem Armenischen von *E. Preuschen,* in Texte und Untersuchungen, new series, Leipzig, 1902, vii. 3. In the edition of *Wright* and *McLean* the Syriac text is followed by a comparison between it and the Armenian. The works on Constantine have been recently edited by *Ivar A. Heikel,* in the Griechische christ-

liche Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte, Leipzig, 1902, i. *Fr. Overbeck,* Über die Anfänge der Kirchengeschichtschreibung (Progr.), Basel, 1892; *Id.,* Die Bischofslisten und die apostolische Nachfolge in der Kirchengeschichte des Eusebius (Progr.), Basel, 1898; *A. Halmel,* Die Entstehung der Kirchengeschichte des Eusebius von Cäsarea, Essen, 1896; *P. Meyer,* De vita Constantini Eusebiana (Progr.), Bonn, 1882.

The following works treat of special questions and problems connected with the Church History: *H. S. Lawlor,* Two notes on Eusebius in Hermathena (1900), xi. 10—49 (cf. § 33, 3); *G. Mercati,* Sul testo e sul senso di Eusebio, Hist. eccl., vi. 16, in Note di letteratura biblica e cristiana antica (Studi e Testi), Rome, 1901, pp. 47—60; *W. E. Crum,* Eusebius and Coptic Church Histories, London, 1902 (cf. § 99, 1); *P. Corssen,* Zu Euseb., Hist. eccl., iii. 39 und iii. 15, in Zeitschr. für die neutestamentl. Wissensch. (1902), iii. 242—246; *E. Schwartz,* Zu Eusebius' Kirchengeschichte: I. Das Martyrium Jakobus des Gerechten, II. Zur Abgarlegende, in Zeitschr. für die neutestamentl. Wissensch. (1903), iv. 48—66; *Fr. Herklotz,* Ὠβλίας (*Eus.,* Hist. eccl., ii. 23), in Zeitschrift für kath. Theol. (1903), xxvii. 572—574; *A. Crivellucci,* Della fede storica di Eusebio nella vita di Costantino, Livorno, 1888; *V Schultze,* Quellenuntersuchungen zur «Vita Constantini» des Eusebius, in Zeitschr. f. Kirchengesch. (1893—1894), xiv. 503—555. Concerning the genuineness of the documents, edicts and letters, and of a discourse of the emperor in the Vita Constantini, see *O. Seeck,* in Zeitschr. f. Kirchengesch. (1898), xxviii. 321—345 (they are genuine), and *A. Crivellucci,* in Studi storici (1898), vii. 411—429 453—459 (some documents are not genuine); also *J. A. Heikel,* in the edition mentioned above, pp. LXVI—LXXXIII (genuine; but he denies the genuineness, or even the composition by Eusebius, of the *Oratio in sanctorum coetum,* sometimes printed as the fifth book of the Vita Constantini). *C. Weyman,* Eusebius von Cäsarea und sein Leben Konstantins, in Histor.-polit. Blätter (1902), cxxix. 873—892; *J. Viteau,* De Eusebii Caesariensis duplici opusculo περὶ τῶν ἐν Παλαιστίνῃ μαρτυρησάντων (Thèse), Paris, 1893; *Br. Violet,* Die pälestinensischen Märtyrer des Eusebius von Cäsarea, ihre ausführlichere Fassung und deren Verhältnis zur kürzeren, in Texte und Untersuchungen — new series, Leipzig, 1896, xiv. 4; *A. Halmel,* Die palästinensischen Märtyrer des Eusebius von Cäsarea in ihrer zweifachen Form, Essen, 1898; *G. Mercati,* I martiri di Palestina d'Eusebio di Cesarea nel codice Sinaitico, in Rendiconti del R. Istituto Lombardo di scienze e lettere, ser. II, Milan, 1897, xxx.

8. SEPARATE EDITIONS AND SPECIAL RESEARCHES (CONTINUED). — *Exegetical works.* His commentaries on the Psalms are printed in *B. de Montfaucon,* Collectio nova Patrum et scriptorum graecor., Paris, 1706, 2 vols; supplements in *A. Mai,* Nova Patrum Bibl., Rome, 1847, iv. part. I, 65—107; additions in *Pitra,* Analecta sacra, Paris, 1883, iii. 365 to 520. New and notable fragments of commentaries on the Psalms in *Mercati,* Alcune note di letteratura patristica, Milan, 1898. The exposition of the Canticle of canticles, edited by *J. Meursius* (Eusebii, Polychronii, Pselli in Canticum canticorum expositiones graece, Leiden, 1617, pp. 1—74) is not only not the work of Eusebius, but contains nothing from his pen. Its proemium, (apparently) attributed to Eusebius, was printed by *Pitra* (l. c. pp. 529—537) because it had been left out by Migne. For more detailed information concerning this commentary on the Canticle of canticles, see *Th. Zahn,* Forschungen zur Gesch. des neutestamentl. Kanons und der altlkirchl. Lit., Erlangen, 1883, ii. 238 ff. *Mai* (l. c.) gives a fragmentary Commentarius in Lucae evangelium (pp. 159—207) and very in-

significant fragments on the Epistle to the Hebrews (p. 207), Daniel (pp. 314 to 316), and Proverbs (p. 316). The same author published copious remains of the three books of Quaestiones et solutiones evangelicae, i. e. a) an Epitome selecta ex compositis ab Eusebio ad Stephanum circa evangelia quaestionibus ac solutionibus, from the first two books (Greek and Latin, pp. 217—254, 16 questions), and an Epitome selecta ex eiusdem Eusebii ad Marinum quaestionum evangelicarum libro, i. e. from the third book (Greek and Latin, pp. 255—267, 4 questions); b) fragments of the same work, from the two first books (pp. 268—282; 279—282 are Syriac fragments) and from the third book (pp. 283—303); c) Ex quaestionibus Eusebii excerpta apud SS. Ambrosium et Hieronymum (pp. 304—309). An eleventh-century codex of the Gospel Harmony (in ten tables) was published in photographic facsimile, with commentary, by *A. Valentini,* Brescia, 1887. Eusebii Pamph. Onamasticon urbium et locorum S. Scripturae. Graece cum lat. Hieronymi interpretatione ediderunt *F. Larsow* et *G. Parthey,* Berlin, 1862. The same works (of Eusebius and Jerome) are edited by *P. de Lagarde,* Onamastica sacra, Göttingen, 1870, 2. ed. 1887; *P. Thomsen,* Palästina nach dem Onamasticon des Eusebius, in Zeitschr. d. d. Palästinavereins (1903), xxvi. 97—142 145—188; *E. Klostermann,* Eusebius' Schrift περὶ τῶν τοπικῶν ὀνομάτων ἐν τῇ θείᾳ γραφῇ, in Texte und Untersuchungen, new series, Leipzig, 1902, viii. 2 b. *Klostermann* has edited anew the Onamasticon of Eusebius, in Die Griech. christl. Schriftsteller etc., Leipzig, 1904, iii. 1. The fragment of the *De solemnitate paschali* was first published by *Mai,* l. c., pp. 208—216.

*Apologetic writings.* The *Praeparatio evangelica* was edited by *F. A. Heinichen,* Leipzig, 1842—1843, 2 vols., and by *Th. Gaisford,* Oxford, 1843, 4 vols.; cf. *J. A. Heikel,* De Praeparationis evangelicae Eusebii edendae ratione quaestiones, Helsingfors, 1888. *Gaisford* also edited the Demonstratio evangelica, Oxford, 1852, 2 vols.; *Mai* discovered and published in Nova Patrum Bibl., iv., pars I, a small fragment of the fifteenth book of the Demonstratio. A new edition of the Demonstratio, with an English version, has been brought out by *C. H. Gifford,* London, 1903, 4 vols. A Syriac version of the De theophania was edited by *S. Lee* from a Codex of the year 411, London, 1842, with an English translation, Cambridge, 1843. Important fragments of the Greek text were discovered by *Mai* and published, l. c., pp. 108—159 310—312. *H. Gressmann,* Studien zu Eusebius' Theophanie, in Texte und Untersuchungen, Leipzig, 1903, viii. 3. *Th. Gaisford* also edited the Eclogae propheticae, Oxford, 1842; cf. *Nolte,* in Theol. Quartalschr. (1861), xliii. 95—109. Some small fragments of other books of the Generalis elementaria introductio are in *Mai,* l. c., pp. 316 to 317. The Adversus Hieroclem, Contra Marcellum and De ecclesiastica theologia were published by *Gaisford,* Oxford, 1852. The Adversus Hieroclem is also found in the edition of Flavius Philostratus by *C. L. Kayser,* Leipzig, 1870—1871, 2 vols. (i. 469—413); *M. Faulhaber,* Die griechischen Apologeten der klassischen Väterzeit: I. Eusebius von Cäsarea, Würzburg, 1895; cf. *A. Seitz,* Die Apologie des Christentums bei den Griechen des 4. und 5. Jahrhunderts, Würzburg, 1895.

*Doctrinal Writings.* We have already mentioned *Gaisford's* editions of the Contra Marcellum and the De ecclesiastica theologia. See *Pitra,* Spicil. Solesmense, i. 338 ff., for extracts from the Letter to Constantia in the Antirrhetica of Nicephorus. For the fourteen Latin homilies see § 61, 2.

9. EUSTATHIUS OF ANTIOCH. — St. Eustathius of Antioch (§ 62, 1) who died in exile in 360 at Trajanopolis in Thrace, left many dogmatic and

exegetical writings, only one of which, it seems, has reached us: his treatise on the Witch of Endor and the apparition to Samuel (1 Kings, xxviii. Septuagint) written against Origen (*Migne*, PG., xviii. 613—674). Eustathius denies the reality of the apparition (cf. St. Gregory of Nyssa, § 69, 2) while at the same time he vigourously refutes the arbitrary allegorizing of Origen. *A. Jahn* brought out a new edition of this treatise, together with the homily it refers to, in Texte und Untersuchungen, Leipzig, 1886, ii. 4. The so-called Commentarius in Hexaemeron (*Migne*, PG., xviii. 707—794) and Allocutio ad imperatorem Constantinum in Concilio Nicaeno (ib., 673—676) are spurious. To the previously known fragments of his lost works *Pitra* and *Martin* have added three Greek and ten Syriac fragments in Analecta sacra ii., Prolog. xxxviii—xl, and iv. 210—213 441—443.

### § 63. St. Athanasius.

1. HIS LIFE. — The life and labors of St. Athanasius presents a complete antithesis to the weak and vacillating character of Eusebius of Cæsarea. The former is the steadfast champion of the true faith, «the pillar of the Church», *ὁ στῦλος τῆς ἐκκλησίας*, as St. Gregory of Nazianzus calls him[1]. He is, at the same time, the God-given physician of her wounds, *ἰατρὸς τῶν ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις ἀῤῥωστημάτων*, says St. Basil the Great[2], truly one of the most imposing figures in all ecclesiastical history. His life and sufferings are most closely connected with the history of Arianism. Athanasius was born about 295 at Alexandria and while quite young attracted the attention of Alexander, bishop of that city. As a youth he was for a considerable period under the direction of the great Saint Anthony, the patriarch of the Cenobites. The other circumstances of his childhood and youth are unknown to us. In 319 Alexander ordained him deacon and made him his secretary and counsellor. He accompanied Alexander to the Council of Nicæa in 325, and proved himself a powerful adversary of the Arians[3]. Alexander died April 17., 328, and Athanasius was unanimously chosen by the people to be his successor[4]. At once the most hateful accusations were brought against him by the Arians, all of which he conclusively disproved. Nevertheless he was condemned by the Arians at their Synod of Tyre in 335 and banished by Constantine to Trier, whence he returned to Alexandria in 338 after the Emperor's death. But the hatred of the Arians was not satisfied; Constantius sided with them, and in 340 Athanasius was again obliged to take refuge in flight. The Arian Pistus, and afterward his fellow heretic George of Cappadocia, took possession of his see amid many bloody excesses. Pope Julius (337—352) pronounced Athanasius an innocent man, and the great Synod of Sardica in Moesia (343 or 344) declared him the rightful occupant of the see of Alexandria. However, it was only in 346 (Oct. 31.) that he was enabled to return to his native city. After

[1] Or. 21, n. 26. [2] Ep. 82. [3] *Socr.*, Hist. eccl., i. 8.
[4] *Athan.*, Apol. c. Arian, c. 6.

the death of his brother Constans (350) the emperor Constantius was again moved by Arian intrigue to oppress the orthodox believers. Yielding to imperial behests the Synods of Arles (353) and Milan (355) deposed Athanasius from his see, into which his old enemy, the Arian George, violently intruded himself (356), while Athanasius fled to the monks in the deserts of Egypt. Julian the Apostate recalled the banished bishops (362); by doing so he hoped to increase the discords of the Christians. But the conciliatory attitude of Athanasius, particularly at the Synod of Alexandria (362), opened a way to the return of many Semiarians. For this he was banished again in 362, on the pretext that he was a disturber of the peace. He was allowed to return by the orthodox Jovian (363—364) who treated him with much distinction. Valens, the successor of Jovian (364—378), was a bigoted Arian and a cruel persecutor both of the orthodox and the Semiarians. A fifth time Athanasius was compelled to quit the city and to travel on (in the middle of 365) the road of exile. So great, however, was the resistance offered by his flock that at the end of four months Valens allowed him to return to Alexandria, where the faithful shepherd was henceforth permitted to live in peace until his death (May 2., 373). He had become the standard bearer of all the Catholics of the East, while in the whole West, *πάσῃ τῇ δύσει*, says St. Basil[1], no one was held in more general esteem.

2. APOLOGETIC WRITINGS. — In the Benedictine edition the series of his works opens with two apologetic treatises: Oratio contra gentes *(λόγος κατὰ Ἑλλήνων)*[2] and Oratio de incarnatione Verbi *(λόγος περὶ τῆς ἐνανθρωπήσεως τοῦ λόγου)*[3], titles that are found apparently in all the manuscripts. They are in reality parts of a homogeneous work known to St. Jerome[4] as *Adversum gentes duo libri.* The first book lays bare in all its nudity and nullity the pagan pantheism and establishes Christian monotheism as the reasonable and necessary religion. The second book defends the Christian faith in the Incarnation of the Divine Word against the objections of Jews and pagans. The work was written before the Arian controversies, about 320. It is a genuine work of Athanasius; the efforts of Schultze and Dräseke to prove the contrary have utterly failed.

3. DOGMATICO-POLEMICAL WRITINGS. — Nearly all his doctrinal works are devoted to the overthrow of Arianism. The longest and most valuable of them is the *Orationes IV contra Arianos (κατὰ Ἀρειανῶν λόγοι δ΄)*[5]. The first book sets forth and develops the Catholic doctrine of the eternal origin of the Son from the Father and the substantial unity of both; the second and the third books are devoted to a detailed exposition of the pertinent scriptural texts; the fourth deals with the personal distinction of the Son from the Father.

[1] Ep. 66. [2] *Migne,* PG., xxv. 3—96. [3] Ib., xxv. 95—198.
[4] De viris ill., c. 87. [5] *Migne,* PG., xxvi. 11—526.

This work was written in the deserts of Egypt during his third exile (356—362). About the same time he wrote the four letters to Serapion, bishop of Thmuis *(πρὸς Σεραπίωνα ἐπιστολαὶ δ')*[1] in refutation of those who admitted the divinity of the Son, but maintained that the Holy Spirit was a creature. Quite akin to the latter work is the treatise on the Trinity and the Holy Ghost *(Liber de Trinitate et de Spiritu Sancto)*[2]. It was written about 365 and is extant only in Latin. Some writers treat as spurious the work «On the Incarnation of the Divine Word and against the Arians» *(περὶ τῆς ἐνσάρκου ἐπιφανείας τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου καὶ κατὰ Ἀρειανῶν)*[3] Brief outlines of the «Faith of the Catholic Church» are found in the letter of the year 363 to the Emperor Jovian *(πρὸς Ἰωβιανὸν περὶ πίστεως)*[4] and the mutilated *Sermo maior de fide (περὶ πίστεως λόγος ὁ μείζων)*[5] Hoss and Stülcken have attacked in vain (1899) the genuineness of the last two works. Caspari was inclined (1866) to attribute to one of Athanasius' immediate successors, Peter or Timothy, the *Interpretatio in symbolum (ἑρμηνεία εἰς τὸ σύμβολον)*[6]. The question about the genuineness of the profession of faith known as *De incarnatione Dei Verbi (περὶ τῆς σαρκώσεως τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου)*[7] is as old as the fifth or sixth century Caspari declared (1879), and rightly, that it belongs to Apollinaris of Laodicea (§ 61, 4). The so-called Athanasian Creed, known also as the *Symbolum Quicumque* from its first word[8] is an admirable resumé of the doctrine of Athanasius, but is not his work. It is rather of Western origin, and was thought to have been composed during the fifth century in Southern Gaul. Burn inclined at first (1896) to the authorship of Honoratus of Arles, but later (1900) accepted with Turner the authorship of Eusebius of Vercelli; Ommaney declared (1897) for Vincent of Lerins. All these conjectures are now set aside by Künstle's researches. In his Antipriscilliana he shows that the Athanasian Creed was written in Spain and was directed against Priscillianism. This Creed was known in the Orient only at a later date and never found a place in the liturgy; in the West it was recited at Prime since the ninth century, was used by the clergy in giving popular instruction as a summary of Christian doctrine, and was held in particular esteem as a basis and criterion of ecclesiastical faith. — A treatise, written before the year 343, on Matt. xi. 27: «All things are given to me by the Father»[9], a text much misused by the Arians, is apparently only a fragment of the original. Very important are three letters about Christological doctrine written about 371: the first to Epictetus, bishop of Corinth *(πρὸς Ἐπίκτητον ἐπίσκοπον Κορίνθου κατὰ τῶν αἱρετικῶν)*[10]; a second to Adelphius, bishop and confessor *(πρὸς Ἀδέλφιον ἐπίσκοπον καὶ ὁμολογητὴν*

[1] Ib., xxvi. 529—676. [2] Ib., xxvi. 1191—1213. [3] Ib., xxvi. 983—1028.
[4] Ib., xxvi. 813—820. [5] Ib., xxv. 199—208. [6] Ib., xxvi. 1231—1232.
[7] Ib., xxviii. 25—30. [8] Ib., xxviii. 1582—1583.
[9] Ib., xxv. 207—220. [10] Ib., xxvi. 1049—1070.

*κατὰ Ἀρειανῶν)*[1]; a third to the philosopher Maximus *(πρὸς Μάξιμον φιλόσοφον)*[2]. The letter to Epictetus was highly esteemed by the contemporaries of Athanasius; it was copied in full by St. Epiphanius in his work against heresies[3] The Nestorians interpolated it, but St. Cyril of Alexandria[4] was able to convict them of fraud by means of ancient manuscripts *(ἀντίγραφα παλαιά)* of the letter. The so-called «Two books against Apollinaris» *(κατὰ Ἀπολλιναρίου λόγοι β')*[5] are referred by the Benedictine editors to the last years of Athanasius. The name of Apollinaris does not appear in the work itself, and there are reasons for doubting its authenticity. Dräseke holds (1889) that these two books were composed at Alexandria soon after the death of the Saint, but by two distinct persons, the first (probably) by Didymus the Blind, and the second (probably) by Ambrosius of Alexandria, a disciple of Didymus[6]. The following works and others are rightly regarded as of dubious parentage: *Testimonia ex Sacra Scriptura de naturali communione similis essentiae inter Patrem et Filium et Spiritum Sanctum*[7], *Epistola catholica*[8], *Refutatio hypocrisis Meletii et Eusebii Samosatensis adv. consubstantialitatem*[9]. The *Disputatio habita in concilio Nicaeno contra Arium*[10], *Doctrina ad Antiochum ducem*[11], *Quaestiones ad Antiochum ducem*[12], and several other works, are known to be spurious.

4. HISTORICO-POLEMICAL WRITINGS. — In his conflicts with the Arians, Athanasius often found himself compelled to appeal to the truth of history. Three apologies were written by him, with a view to justify his conduct: the Apology against the Arians *(ἀπολογητικὸς κατὰ Ἀρειανῶν)*[13], written about 350 and as an historical authority of primary importance; the Apology to the Emperor Constantius *(πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα Κωνστάντιον ἀπολογία)*[14], written in 356; and the Apology for his flight *(ἀπολογία περὶ τῆς φυγῆς αὐτοῦ)*[15], written in 357 or 358. Two encyclical letters hold up to public scorn the unworthy conduct of his enemies: one written in 341 to all the bishops *(ἐπιστολὴ ἐγκύκλιος)*[16], and another in 356 to the bishops of Egypt and Libya *(πρὸς τοὺς ἐπισκόπους Αἰγύπτου καὶ Λιβύης ἐπιστολὴ ἐγκύκλιος κατὰ Ἀρειανῶν)*[17]. The letters on the decrees of the Council of Nicæa[18] and on the doctrine of Dionysius[19], bishop of Alexandria, belong to the years 350—354 (§ 40, 3). The letter to the monks[20], mutilated at the beginning, gives a history of Arianism from 335—357, and is usually entitled *Historia Arianorum*. The brief letter to the

[1] *Migne*, PG., xxvi. 1071—1084. [2] Ib., xxvi. 1085—1090.
[3] Haer. 77. [4] Ep. 40 and 45. [5] *Migne*, PG., xxvi. 1093—1166.
[6] *Hier.*, De viris ill., c. 126. [7] *Migne*, PG., xxviii. 29—80.
[8] Ib., xxviii. 81—84. [9] Ib., xxviii. 85—90. [10] Ib., xxviii. 439—502.
[11] Ib., xxviii. 555—590. [12] Ib., xxviii. 597—708. [13] Ib., xxv. 247—410.
[14] Ib., xxv. 595—642. [15] Ib., xxv. 643—680. [16] Ib., xxv. 221—240.
[17] Ib., xxv. 537—594. [18] Ib., xxv. 415—476. [19] Ib., xxv. 479—522.
[20] Ib., xxv. 691—796.

bishop Serapion[1], written soon after, 358, relates the terrible death of Arius. A letter of the year 359 reviews the history of the doings of the Councils of Rimini in Italy and of Seleucia in Isauria of the same year[2]. Two letters to Lucifer[3], bishop of Cagliari, extant in Latin only and probably written in Latin, perhaps in 360, give lively expression to his admiration for the firm resistance of Lucifer to the attacks of the Arians. The synodal letter to the people of Antioch (*ὁ πρὸς τοὺς Ἀντιοχεῖς τόμος*)[4] and the letter to Rufinianus[5] treat of the measures taken at the Council of Alexandria (362) with regard to the reception of the Arians to ecclesiastical communion. The letter to the bishops of (Western) Africa[6] warns them against the intrigues of the Arians, and may have been written about 369.

5. EXEGETICAL WORKS. — We possess, apparently, only fragments of his exegetical writings. They have come down in Catenae or Catenae-like compilations, and their respective authenticity is not free from suspicion. The most important of them belong to a commentary on the Psalms[7], and have reached us through the Catenae of Psalms of Nicetas of Serrae (end of the eleventh century). This compiler usually draws his literal interpretation of the Scripture text from Theodoret of Cyrus and the mystical exposition mostly from Athanasius, who manifests, here at least, a decided predilection for allegorical exegesis and application of the biblical text. In the Benedictine edition these fragments of Psalm-commentaries are preceded by a long letter to a certain Marcellinus[8] in which Athanasius expresses his great joy at the interest his correspondent takes in the Psalms; the latter is assured that a profound study of them will prove very instructive and useful. While the authenticity of this letter is beyond doubt, it is not at all certain that it is in any way related to the commentary which follows. In 1746, a second commentary on the Psalms was published by N. Antonelli under the name of St. Athanasius[9]; it confines itself to the exposition of the titles of the Psalms and to a simple paraphrase of the text. At present this commentary is not considered to be by our Saint, but is attributed to Hesychius of Jerusalem. St. Jerome mentions[10] among the works of the Saint a *Liber de Psalmorum titulis*, but the identity of this work with the Antonelli commentary is very doubtful. Photius had in his hands a commentary of Athanasius on Ecclesiastes and the Canticle of canticles[11] Fragments of a commentary on Job are printed in the Benedictine edition[12] In the same collection are found fragments

[1] Ib., xxv. 685—690. [2] Ib., xxvi. 681—794.
[3] Ib., xxvi. 1181—1186. [4] Ib., xxvi. 795—810.
[5] Ib., xxvi. 1179—1182. [6] Ib., xxvi. 1029—1048.
[7] Ib., xxvii. 55—590; some new fragments were published, in 1888, by Pitra.
[8] Ib., xxvii. 11—46. [9] Ib., xxvii. 649—1344. [10] De viris ill., c. 87.
[11] Bibl. Cod. 139.
[12] *Migne*, PG., xxvii. 1343—1348; other fragments were added by Pitra, in 1888.

of a commentary on the Canticle of canticles[1], St. Matthew[2], St. Luke[3] and on 1 Corinthians[4]. All these exegetical materials have been drawn from the Catenae. The so-called *Synopsis Scripturae Sacrae (σύνοψις ἐπίτομος τῆς θείας γραφῆς)*[5], a work that describes the contents of all the scriptural books, in many places with much acumen and fulness, was not written by our Saint.

6. ASCETICAL WORKS. — In 357 (365?) Athanasius composed a biography of St. Anthony *(βίος καὶ πολιτεία τοῦ ὁσίου πατρὸς ἡμῶν Ἀντωνίου*[6]*)* as the model of a life consecrated to the service of God. It was translated into Latin by Evagrius of Antioch († 393) and contributed much, both in East and West, to the growing enthusiasm for the ascetic and monastic life. In the Benedictine edition the Latin translation is joined to the Greek text. It is an authentic and trustworthy work; the attacks made on it in these respects by Weingarten (1877) have been successfully refuted by Eichhorn and Mayer (1888). The genuineness of the *Syntagma doctrinae ad monachos (σύνταγμα διδασκαλίας πρὸς μονάζοντας*[7]*)*, that uses tacitly but extensively the Didache (§ 6), is open to doubt, likewise that of the *De virginitate sive de ascesi (περὶ παρθενίας ἤτοι περὶ ἀσκήσεως*[8]*)*. On the other hand, there is no reason to suspect the authenticity of several letters written to monks, among them one to the abbot Dracontius[9], two to the abbot Orsisius or Orsiesius[10], one to the monk Amunis[11], and one to the monks of Egypt[12]

7. FESTAL LETTERS. — Mention has already been made (§ 40, 4) of the so-called festal letters of the bishops of Alexandria. The original text of those composed by Athanasius has been lost, apart from some fragments[13]. In 1847 a collection of these letters in Syriac was found in a monastery of the Nitrian desert; they were edited by Cureton in 1848[14]. The manuscript of Cureton was a mutilated one, and contained only fifteen entire Letters, of the years 329—348 (in 336 337 340 343 344 Athanasius issued no Festal Letters). These Letters have rendered valuable service to the modern historians of Arianism. Some fragments of the Saint's Festal Letters have lately been discovered in a Coptic version.

8. TEACHING OF ATHANASIUS CONCERNING CHRIST AND THE TRINITY. — The Christology of Athanasius is all in the phrase: «God became man in order to deify men», i. e. in order to raise men to the rank of adoptive sons of God *(οὐκ ἄρα ἄνθρωπος ὢν*

[1] *Migne,* PG., xxvii. 1347—1350; cf. 1349—1362. [2] Ib., xxvii. 1363—1390.
[3] Ib., xxvii. 1391—1404; with new fragments published by Mai, in 1844.
[4] Ib., xxvii. 1403—1404. [5] Ib., xxviii. 283—438.
[6] Ib., xxvi. 835—976. [7] Ib., xxviii. 835—846. [8] Ib., xxviii. 251—282.
[9] Ib., xxv. 523—534. [10] Ib., xxvi. 977—980. [11] Ib., xxvi. 1169—1176.
[12] Ib., xxvi., 1185—1188. [13] Ib., xxvi. 1431—1444.
[14] *Migne,* PL., xxvi. 1351—1444, in a Latin version.

ὕστερον γέγονε θεὸς· ἀλλὰ θεὸς ὢν ὕστερον γέγονεν ἄνθρωπος. ἵνα μᾶλλον ἡμᾶς θεοποιήσῃ)[1]. Inasmuch as we have a part in the Son, we have also, according the words of Holy Scripture, a part in God (αὐτοῦ γὰρ τοῦ υἱοῦ μετέχοντες τοῦ θεοῦ μετέχειν λεγόμεθα[2], τούτου γὰρ μεταλαμβάνοντες τοῦ πατρὸς μετέχομεν, διὰ τὸ τοῦ πατρὸς εἶναι ἴδιον τὸν λογον[3]. Unless Christ were true God, He could not fulfil his office as Redeemer. «If He were the divinity and the image of the Father only by participation (ἐκ μετουσίας), and not essentially and by Himself, (ἐξ αὐτοῦ), He would not have been able to deify others, since Himself must first have been made like unto God. For it is not possible that anyone should share with another that which himself has only through participation, since that which he has is not his own property but the property of him who gave it, and what he has received suffices only to satisfy his own need of grace.»[4] «If the Son were a creature, man would none the less remain mortal, because not united with God. For a creature cannot unite creatures with God, since himself must be united with God through another creature, and no member of creation can redeem creation, because itself is in need of redemption.»[5] It is quite impossible that there should be a middle something between the Creator and the creature. The thesis of Arius that in order to create the world God needed a middle being is very easily shown to be false. God is neither so impotent that He could not have created all things Himself, nor so arrogant that He would have disdained to create them[6]. Christ is therefore true God. God is certainly a unity (μονάς), but in this unity is included a trinity (τριάς). There is one divinity in this trinity (μία θεότης ἐστὶν ἐν τριάδι[7], διὰ τὸ καὶ μίαν εἶναι ἐν τῇ ἁγίᾳ τριάδι θέοτητα)[8]. The very name Father supposes the existence of a Son (πατέρα γὰρ οὐκ ἄν τις εἴποι μὴ ὑπάρχοντος υἱοῦ[9], ὁ δὲ τὸν θεὸν πατέρα λέγων εὐθὺς ἐν αὐτῷ καὶ τὸν υἱὸν σημαίνει)[10]. The Son however is not from nothing, nor from the will of the Father, but from the substance of the Father (ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ πατρός[11]), and this origin of the Son from the nature of the Father is essentially different from the origin of creatures from the will of the Father (ὅσῳ οὖν τοῦ κτίσματος ὁ υἱὸς ὑπέρκειται, τοσούτῳ καὶ τῆς βουλήσεως τὸ κατὰ φύσιν[12]). The Son is co-eternal with the Father, and there was never a time when the Son was not (ὡς θεοῦ τοῦ ἀεὶ ὄντος ἴδιος ὢν υἱὸς ἀϊδίως ὑπάρχει[13]). The Son shares with the Father the entire plenitude of the divinity (τὸ πλήρωμα τῆς τοῦ πατρὸς θεότητός ἐστι τὸ εἶναι τοῦ υἱοῦ καὶ ὅλος θεός ἐστιν ὁ υἱός[14]). Generation as predicated of the Son, does not mean the act of being made, but signifies participation in the entire substance of the Father (τὸ γὰρ

[1] Or. c. Ar., i. 39. [2] Ib., i. 16. [3] De synodis, c. 51. [4] Ib.
[5] Or. c. Ar., ii. 69. [6] Ib., ii. 24 25. [7] Ib., i. 18.
[8] Ep. ad Iov., c. 4. [9] Or. c. Ar., iii. 6. [10] De decr. Nic. syn., c. 30.
[11] Ib., c. 19. [12] Or. c. Ar., iii. 62. [13] Ib., i. 14. [14] Ib., iii. 6.

*ὅλως μετέχεσθαι τὸν θεὸν ἴσον ἐστὶ λέγειν ὅτι καὶ γεννᾷ*[1]. They are two, Father and Son, but their nature is one, and that unity is indivisible and inseparable *(δύο μέν εἰσιν, ὅτι ὁ πατὴρ πατήρ ἐστι καὶ οὐχ ὁ αὐτὸς υἱός ἐστι· καὶ ὁ υἱὸς υἱός ἐστι καὶ οὐχ ὁ αὐτὸς πατήρ ἐστι· μία δὲ ἡ φύσις*[2]*, ὥστε δύο μὲν εἶναι πατέρα καὶ υἱόν, μονάδα δὲ θεότητος ἀδιαίρετον καὶ ἄσχιστον*[3]*)*. The Spirit of God shares the same divinity and the same power *(τῆς αὐτῆς θεότητός ἐστι καὶ τῆς αὐτῆς ἐξουσίας*[4]*)*. The Source *(ἡ πηγή)*[5] of the Holy Spirit is the Son who is with the Father. The Holy Spirit is inseparable from the substance of the Father and the Son *(τὸ δὲ ἅγιον πνεῦμα οὐ κτίσμα οὐδὲ ξένον, ἀλλ' ἴδιον καὶ ἀδιαίρετον τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ πατρός*[6]*)*. He is of one and the same substance with the Father and the Son *(τοῦ λόγου ἑνὸς ὄντος ἴδιον καὶ τοῦ θεοῦ ἑνὸς ὄντος ἴδιον καὶ ὁμοούσιόν ἐστι*[7]*)*. There is, therefore, but one divinity and one God in three persons *(μία γὰρ ἡ θεότης καὶ εἷς θεὸς ἐν τρισὶν ὑποστάσεσιν)*[8].

9. COMPLETE EDITIONS. TRANSLATIONS. CRITICAL STUDIES. — The first complete edition of the original text of the writings of St. Athanasius appeared at Heidelberg, 1600—1601, ex officina Commeliniana, 2 vols. A second edition was brought out by *J. Piscator,* Paris, 1627, 2 vols., and reprinted at Cologne in 1686. The best edition is that of the Benedictines of St. Maur (Maurists), *J. Lopin* and *B. de Montfaucon,* Paris, 1698, 3 vols. The reprint of this edition, at Padua, 1777, by *N. A. Giustiniani,* bishop of that city, has still a fourth volume, in which are included many hitherto unprinted writings of Athanasius, most of them discovered by *de Montfaucon.* The *Giustiniani* edition is reprinted with additions in *Migne,* PG., xxv—xxviii, Paris, 1857. We owe to *J. C. Thilo* a selection of the dogmatico-polemical and historico-polemical writings of St. Athanasius reprinted from the Benedictine edition (Bibl. Patrum graec. dogm. edendam curavit Thilo, vol. i), Leipzig, 1853. Cf. *F. Wallis,* On some Mss. of the writings of St. Athanasius, in Journal of Theological Studies (1901—1902), iii. 94—109 245—258. *Lake,* Some further notes on the Mss. of the writings of St. Athanasius, in Journal of Theol. Studies (1903 to 1904), v. 108—114. German translations of selected works were made by *J. Fisch* and *P. A. Richard,* Kempten, 1872—1875, 2 vols. (Bibl. der Kirchenväter). There is an English version of the most important works of St. Athanasius by *A. Robertson (J. H. Newman),* in Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church, New York, 1892, series II, iv. Select treatises of St. Athanasius in controversy with the Arians (Cardinal *Newman*), 2 vols. *E. Fialon,* St. Athanase, étude littéraire, Paris, 1877. *K. Hoss,* Studien über das Schrifttum und die Theologie des Athanasius auf Grund einer Echtheitsuntersuchung von *Athanasius contra gentes* und *De incarnatione,* Freiburg, 1899. *A. Stülcken,* Athanasiana. Literar- und dogmengeschichtliche Untersuchungen, Leipzig, 1899, in Texte und Untersuchungen, xix, new series, iv. 4. *X. Le Bachelet,* S. J., Dictionnaire de la Théologie Catholique, Paris, 1903, i. 2144—2178: St. Athanase.

[1] Or. c. Ar., i. 16. [2] Ib., iii. 4. [3] Ib., iv. 1.
[4] De incarn. et c. Ar., c. 9. [5] Ib. [6] Tom. ad Ant., c. 5.
[7] Ep. ad Serap., i. 27. [8] De incarn. et c. Ar., c. 10.

10. SEPARATE EDITIONS AND VERSIONS. SPECIAL RESEARCHES. — APOLOGETICAL WORKS. A separate edition of the *Oratio de incarnatione Verbi* was published by *A. Robertson*, London, 1882 1893. The authenticity of the two apologetic treatises was first called in question by *V Schultze*, Geschichte des Untergangs des griechisch-römischen Heidentums, Jena, 1887, i. 118, afterwards decidedly denied by *J. Dräseke*, in Theol. Studien und Kritiken (1893), lxvi. 251—315. The Athanasian authorship was sustained by *Hoss*, l. c. (see above no. 9), pp. 1—95, and *Stülcken*, l. c. (above no. 9), pp. 1—23. For the *Oratio contra gentes* see the work of *A. Lebentopulos*, quoted in § 17, 3. — DOGMATICO-POLEMICAL WORKS. *Dräseke*, in Zeitschr. für wissenschaftl. Theol. (1893), xxxvi. 1, 290—315, *Hoss*, l. c., pp. 123—127, and *Stülcken*, l. c., pp. 50—58, call the fourth and last of the *Orationes IV contra Arianos* spurious. The *Liber de Trinitate et Spiritu Sancto* is also found as the last of twelve books *de Trinitate* among the writings of Vigilius, bishop of Tapsus (*Migne*, PL., lxii. 237—334). *T H. Bentley* brought out an edition of the *De incarnatione Dei Verbi et contra Arianos*, London, 1887, 2. ed., ib., 1902. The authenticity of the *Expositio fidei* and of the *Sermo maior de fide* has been denied by *Hoss*, l. c., pp. 104—123, and by *Stülcken*, l. c., pp. 23—40. The *Interpretatio in symbolum* (ἑρμηνεία εἰς τὸ σύμβολον) is commented on with great learning by *C. P Caspari*, in his Ungedruckte Quellen zur Gesch. des Taufsymbols und der Glaubensregel, Christiania, 1866, i. 1—72, where there is also (i. 143—160) a critical edition of the Greek text (with an ancient Syriac version) of the profession of faith known as *De incarnatione Dei Verbi* (περὶ τῆς σαρκώσεως τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου); for its origin see *Caspari*, Alte und neue Quellen etc., Christiania, 1879, pp. 102 ff. The Maurists edited the *Symbolum Athanasianum*, in the Latin original, four Greek versions and two Old-French versions (*Migne*, PG., xxviii. 1581—1596). Two other Greek versions are found in *Caspari*, Ungedruckte Quellen, iii. 263—267 For a series of commentaries on the Athanasianum see *A. E. Burn*, The Athanasian Creed and its early Commentaries, Cambridge, 1896, in Texts and Studies, iv. 1. *Id.*, An Introduction to the Creeds and to the Te Deum, London, 1899. *G. D. W Ommaney*, A critical dissertation on the Athanasian Creed, its original language, date, authorship, titles, text, reception and use, Oxford, 1897 *G. Morin*, Le symbole d'Athanase et son premier témoin Césaire d'Arles, in Revue Bénédictine (1901), xviii. 338—363. *A. E. Burn*, On Eusebius of Vercelli, in Journal of Theological Studies (1900), i. 592—599. *F. N. Oxenham*, The Athanasian Creed, London, 1902. *K. Künstle*, Antipriscilliana, Freiburg, 1905. On the «Two Books against Apollinaris» see *J. Dräseke*, Gesammelte Patristische Untersuch., Altona, 1889, pp. 169—207, also *Stülcken*, l. c. (see above, no. 9), pp. 70—75. The spurious *Doctrina ad Antiochum ducem* (*Migne*, PG., xxviii. 555—590), noteworthy for its reference to the «Shepherd» of Hermas, was edited anew by *W. Dindorf*, Athanasii Alexandrini praecepta ad Antiochum. Ad codices duos recensuit G. D., Leipzig, 1857. In this work (pp. vi—xii and 63—77) Dindorf reprinted from a *Cod. Guelpherbytanus* (saec. x.) a copious *varietas lectionis* relative to the spurious *Quaestiones ad Antiochum ducem* (*Migne*, PG., xxviii. 597—708), a compilation from ancient works, among them some of Athanasius, made by various utterly unknown hands. For the seven Dialogues on the Trinity (*Migne*, PG., xxviii. 1115—1338: *Dialogi* v *de Trinitate* and *Dialogi* ii *contra Macedonianos*) and the *Confutationes quarumdam propositionum* (Ib., xxviii. 1337—1394) see § 78, 8. *F. Wallis*, On some Mss. of the writings of St. Athanasius, in Journal of Theol. Studies (1902), iii. 245—258.

11. SEPARATE EDITIONS AND TRANSLATIONS. SPECIAL RESEARCHES (CONTINUED). — *Historico-Polemical writings.* For a refutation of some doubts

concerning the authenticity of the *Historia Arianorum ad monachos* see *A. Eichhorn,* Athanasii de vita ascetica testimonia collecta, Halle, 1886, pp. 57—62. — *Exegetical writings.* The genuineness of the second Psalm-commentary (*Migne,* PG., xxvii. 649—1344) was denied by *H. Sträter,* Die Erlösungslehre des hl. Athanasius, Freiburg, 1894, pp. 29—35, and by *M. Faulhaber,* in Theol. Quartalschr. (1901), lxxxiii. 218—232. The latter attributes it to Hesychius of Jerusalem (§ 79, 3), and corroborates the thesis of *G. Mercati,* in Note di letteratura biblica e cristiana antica (Studi e Testi v), Rome, 1901, pp. 144—179: «Il commentario di Esichio Gerosolimitano sui salmi» *Cardinal Mai* published (Nova Patrum Bibl., Rome, 1844, ii, part 2) under the name of Athanasius *In Lucae evangelium commentariorum excerpta* (pp. 567—582), and *fragmenta alia* (pp. 583—584); the latter are reprinted in *Migne,* PG., xxvi. 1291—1294, though I have sought there in vain for the *excerpta. Pitra,* Analecta sacra et classica (1888), part 1, made known under the name of Athanasius some fragments *ex commentario in Psalmos* (pp. 3—20) and *ex commentario in Job* (pp. 21—26). On the *Synopsis Scripturae Sacrae* see *Charteris,* Canonicity, Edinburgh, 1880; *Th. Zahn,* Gesch. des neutestamentl. Kanons, Erlangen, 1890, ii. 1, 302—318; cf. *E. Klostermann,* Analecta zur Septuaginta, Hexapla und Patristik, Leipzig, 1895, pp. 75 ff. — *Ascetic writings* A handy edition of the *Vita S. Antonii* was brought out by *A. F. Maunoury,* Paris, 1887 and 1890. The authenticity and credibility of this work were attacked by *H. Weingarten,* Der Ursprung des Mönchtums im nachconstantinischen Zeitalter, Gotha, 1877. Weingarten was refuted by *A. Eichhorn,* Athanasii de vita ascetica testimonia collecta (Inaug.-Diss.), Halle, 1886, and by *J. Mayer,* in Der Katholik (1886), i. 495—516 619—636; ii. 72—86 173—193. *Dom Cuthbert Butler,* The Lausiac History of Palladius, i, in Texts and Studies, Cambridge, 1898, vi. 1, 215—228. The Latin version of Evagrius may also be found in the Bollandists, in the Acta SS. Jan., Antwerp, 1643, ii. 120—141. In his Acta martyrum et sanctorum, Paris, 1895, v. 1—121, *Bedjan* made known an ancient Syriac version of the work; cf. *Fr. Schulthess,* Probe einer syrischen Version der *Vita S. Antonii* (Inaug.-Diss.), Leipzig, 1894. *P. Batiffol* edited anew (and pronounced spurious) the Syntagma doctrinae ad monachos, in Studia patristica, Paris, 1890, ii. 117—160. *Id.,* On the De virginitate seu de ascesi, in Römische Quartalschr. für christl. Altertumskunde u. f. Kirchengesch. (1893), vii. 275——286. — The *Festal Letters.* The Festal Letters of Athanasius, discovered in an ancient Syriac version, and edited by *W. Cureton,* London, 1848. The Syriac text is reprinted, with a Latin version, in *Mai,* Nova Patrum Bibl., Rome, 1853, vi, part 1 (*Migne,* PG., xxvi. 1351—1444). A German translation of the Festal Letters was made by *F. Larsow,* Die Festbriefe des hl. Athanasius, Bischofs von Alexandria, Leipzig, 1852. *Th. Zahn,* Gesch. des neutestamentl. Kanons, Erlangen, 1890, ii. 1, 203—212 Der Osterfest-Brief des Athanasius vom Jahre 367 (*Migne,* PG., xxvi. 1435—1440). *Id.* (apropos of this Festal Letter), Athanasius und der Bibelkanon, Leipzig, 1901. Concerning some Coptic fragments of the same letter and its biblical canon cf. *C. Schmidt,* in Nachrichten von der k. Gesellsch. der Wissensch. zu Göttingen, Phil.-hist. Kl. (1898), pp. 167—203; *Id.,* Ein neues Fragment des Osterfest-Briefes des Athanasius vom Jahre 367, ib., 1901. For Coptic fragments of other Festal Letters see *H. Achelis,* in Theol. Literaturzeitung (1899), pp. 663 f. *W. Riedel* and *W. E. Crum,* The Canons of Athanasius of Alexandria. The Arabic and Coptic Versions edited and translated (Text and Translation Society), London, 1904. — *Other spurious works.* The *Fides Nicaena* (*Migne,* PG., xxviii. 1637—1644) was edited again by *P. Batiffol,* in Didascalia

cccxviii Patrum pseudepigrapha, e graecis codicibus recensuit *P. Batiffol,* Coptico contulit *H. Hyvernat,* Paris, 1887. *E. Revillout* had already made known two Coptic texts of this small work. For more explicit details see *A. Eichhorn,* in Theol. Literaturzeitung (1887), pp. 569—571. The *Tractatus S. Athanasii de ratione paschae* (*Migne,* PG., xxviii. 1605—1610), extant in Latin only, is a recasting of the *De pascha* by Martin of Bracara (§ 119, 1). Cf. *F. Piper,* Über den Verfasser der dem Athanasius beigelegten Schrift «De paschate», Berlin, 1862. For the *Historia imaginis Berytensis* (Ib., xxviii. 797—824) in two Greek and two Latin recensions, see *Wildt,* in Kirchenlexikon (1882), 2. ed., i. 1543—1547; *v. Dobschütz,* Christusbilder, Leipzig, 1899, pp. 280 ff. *H. E. Taiezi* published at Venice (1899) an ancient Armenian translation of Athanasiana, treatises, sermons, letters and spurious matter; also some fragments unknown in the Greek, among them a discourse that is also extant in Coptic (*F. Rossi,* I papiri copti del Museo Egiziano de Tarmo, Tarmo, 1888, ii. 1). There is in Taiezi a fragment of the letter of Athanasius to his disciple and successor Timotheos; cf. § 63, 3 and 79, 4.

12. WORKS ON ATHANASIUS. — To the ancient authorities for the life of the Saint we may now add some fragments of a Coptic eulogium edited by *O. v. Lemm,* Koptische Fragmente zur Patriarchengeschichte Alexandriens, Petersburg, 1888. Cf. *J. A. Möhler,* Athanasius der Grosse und die Kirche seiner Zeit, besonders im Kampfe mit dem Arianismus, Mainz, 1827, 2. vols., 2. ed. 1844. *Fr. Böhringer,* Die griechischen Väter des 3. und 4. Jahrhunderts. 2. Hälfte: Athanasius und Arius (Die Kirche Christi und ihre Zeugen oder die Kirchengeschichte in Biographien, vol. i., sect. 2., half 2., ed. 2.), Stuttgart, 1874. *G. Krüger,* Die Bedeutung des Athanasius, in Jahrb. f. protest. Theol. (1890), xvi. 337—356. Contributions to the chronology of the life of Athanasius were made by *A. v. Gutschmid,* Kleine Schriften, herausgegeben von *Fr. Rühl,* Leipzig, 1890, ii. 427—449. *H. Voigt,* Die Lehre des Athanasius von Alexandrien oder die kirchliche Dogmatik des 4. Jahrhunderts auf Grund der biblischen Lehre vom Logos, Bremen, 1861. *Ch. Vernet,* Essai sur la doctrine christologique d'Athanase-le-Grand (Thèse), Genève, 1879. *L. Atzberger,* Die Logoslehre des hl. Athanasius, München, 1880. *G. Voisin,* La doctrine christologique de Saint Athanase, in Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique (1900), i. 226—248. *G. A. Pell,* Die Lehre des hl. Athanasius von der Sünde und Erlösung, Passau, 1888. *H. Sträter,* Die Erlösungslehre des hl. Athanasius, Freiburg, 1894. *K. Bornhauser,* Die Vergötterungslehre des Athanasius und Johannes Damascenus, Gütersloh, 1903. *F. Lauchert,* Die Lehre des hl. Athanasius d. Gr., Leipzig, 1895. *H. Lietzmann,* Chronologie der ersten und zweiten Verbannung des Athanasius, in Zeitschr. f. wissensch. Theol. (1901), xliv. 380—390. *Gwatkin,* Studies on Arianism, Cambridge, 1900.

13. ALEXANDER OF ALEXANDRIA. — Two letters about the heresy of Arius from the pen of this bishop of Alexandria (see no. 1) are extant, both written before the Council of Nicæa, one to Alexander, bishop of Constantinople, and the other to all the bishops (*Migne,* PG., xviii. 547 to 582). It is clear from these letters that Alexander grasped at once the true significance of the teaching of Arius. He does not use the term ὁμοούσιος, but he does call the Blessed Virgin ἡ θεοτόκος (Ep. i., c. 12). Some Greek fragments current under his name are collected in *Migne,* PG., xviii. 581—584, also a Syriac *Sermo de anima et corpore deque passione Domini* (ib., 585—608, Syriac and Latin) and several short Syriac fragments edited by *Martin,* in *Pitra,* Analecta sacra, iv. 196—200 430 to 434 (Syriac and Latin). For the Syriac sermon and the Syriac fragments cf. *G. Krüger,* in Zeitschr. für wissensch. Theol. (1888), xxxi. 434—448;

*C. Thomas*, Melito von Sardes, Osnabrück, 1893, pp. 40—51. See also § 19, 3.

14. POPES JULIUS I. AND LIBERIUS. — Julius I. (337—352) was the sole support in troublous times of the bishops persecuted for their opposition to Arianism (see no. 1). We possess two Greek letters from his hand: Ad Antiochenos and Ad Alexandrinos (*Migne*, PL., viii. 897—912). Other writings current under his name are Apollinarist forgeries (§ 61, 4), among them the four letters in Greek, Apollinarist or Monophysite in tendency, in *Migne*, PG., viii. 873—877 929—936 953—961; also in *P. A. de Lagarde*, Titi Bostreni quae ex opere contra Manichaeos edito in cod. Hamburg. servata sunt graece, Berlin, 1859, pp. 114—124. A Syriac version of these letters is in *de Lagarde*, Analecta syriaca, Leipzig and London, 1858, pp. 67—79, and in *J. Fr. A. Veith*, Epistolae nonnullae sub Iulii I nomine divulgatae (Diss. inaug.), Breslau, 1862. The seven Syriac fragments attributed to Julius I. are also in *G. Mösinger*, Monumenta Syriaca, Innsbruck, 1878, ii. 1—5. — There are extant under the name of Pope Liberius (352—366) several letters in Latin and a letter in Greek Ad universos orientis orthodoxos episcopos (*Migne*, PL., viii. 1349—1358 1372 to 1373 1381—1386); cf. *Jaffé*, Regesta Pontificum Rom., 2. ed., Leipzig, 1885, i. n. 208—216 223 228. Saint Ambrose (De virginibus, iii. 1—3) has handed down the discourse pronounced by Liberius on the occasion of the religious consecration of Marcellina, the sister of Ambrose. Theodoret (Hist. eccl., ii. 13) has saved for us the declarations in which Liberius resisted at Milan (355) the demands of the emperor Constantius. It is probable that Liberius subscribed the third Sirmian formula and thereby sacrificed, not orthodoxy, but the term ὁμοούσιος; cf. *H. Grisar*, in Kirchenlexikon, 2. ed., 1891, vii. 1951—1959. The four Latin letters that are quoted as proof of the pope's lapse into Arianism are now recognized as forgeries (*Migne*, PL., viii. 1365—1372 1395); cf. also *Jaffé*, l. c., n. 217 to 219 and 207; the same is true of the Greek letter to Athanasius and the reply of the latter (*Migne*, PL., viii. 1395—1440, and PG., xxviii. 1441 to 1446; *Jaffé*, n. 229), likewise of other writings ascribed at different times to Liberius (*Jaffé*, n. 222 224—247). *L. de Feis*, Storia di Liberio papa e dello scisma dei Semiariani, Rome, 1894.

### § 64. The representatives of Egyptian Monachism.

1. SAINT ANTHONY. — Saint Anthony the Great, who found his first biographer in St. Athanasius (§ 63, 6), passes for the founder of the cenobitic life. He died in 356, at the age of one hundred and five, on Mount Colzim near the Red Sea. St. Athanasius inserted in his «Vita Antonii» (cc. 16—43) a long discourse of the Saint to his monks, translated from «Egyptian» (Coptic). St. Jerome[1] was acquainted with seven letters *apostolici sensus sermonisque* addressed by Anthony to several monasteries, and translated from Egyptian into Greek; the most important *(praecipua est)* was a letter ad *Arsenoitas*. There are grave difficulties against the identification of these letters with the *epistolae septem S. Antonii* still current in Latin. Discourses and thoughts of this «father of the monks» were set down in writing by some of his disciples. Some ascetical works have been falsely attributed to him.

[1] De viris ill., c. 88.

There are some Coptic fragments of letters, under the name of Anthony, Ad S. Theodorum and Ad S. Athanasium, in *J. A. Mingarelli,* Aegyptiorum codicum reliquiae Venetiis in bibliotheca Naniana asservatae, Bologna, 1785, pp. cxcviii—cciii. A short letter to Theodorus, translated from the Egyptian, in Epistola Ammonis episc. ad Theophilum papam Alexandriae, is found in the Bollandists, in the Acta SS. *Mai,* iii. 70 (p. 355, in Latin), and is reprinted in *Migne,* PG., xl. 1065. Migne (l. c., 961—1100) contains also the following Latin writings attributed to Saint Anthony: Sermo de vanitate mundi et de resurrectione mortuorum, Sermones XX ad filios suos monachos, Epistolae VII ex Graeco Latine redditae interprete Valerio de Sarasio, Epistolae XX ex Arabico Latini iuris factae ab Abrahamo Ecchellensi Maronita e Libano, Regulae ac praecepta ad filios suos monachos, Spiritualia documenta, Admonitiones et documenta varia, Sententiarum quarumdam S. Antonii expositio facta a quodam sene, Interrogationes quaedam a diversis S. Antonio factae eiusque ad easdem responsiones, Dicta quaedam S. Antonii. The seven letters have been also published (Latin text) by *A. Erdinger,* Innsbruck, 1871. *A. Verger,* Vie de St. Antoine-le-Grand, patriarche des cénobites, Tours, 1890. *B. Contzen,* Die Regel des hl. Antonius (Progr.), Metten, 1896. *J. Besse,* Dict. de la Théologie Catholique, Paris, 1903, i. 1441—1443: St. Antoine.

2. ST. PACHOMIUS. — If Anthony was the father of the monks, his disciple Pachomius was their first legislator. The scene of his life and labors was Tabennesus, north of Thebes, on the right bank of the Nile, where the monastic colony grew until it counted thousands of members. He died in 345 according to Grützmacher, in 346 (May 9.) according to Ladeuze. His rule was probably the outgrowth of time and was written originally in Coptic. Ladeuze thinks that the short Greek text in Palladius[1] is by no means the oldest form of the rule; the Latin text in Saint Jerome[2] is a translation from the Greek and represents the condition of the rule about the year 400. There are added to this version some exhortations and several letters of Pachomius[3]

The historical authorities for the life and labors of Pachomius are: a Greek biography of the Saint and of his disciple Theodorus, some Coptic and Arabic documents published by *E. Amélineau* in 1889 and 1895, a Syriac History of Pachomius edited by *P. Bedjan* in 1895, and other documents; cf. *G. Grützmacher,* Pachomius und das älteste Klosterleben, Freiburg, 1895; *P. Ladeuze,* Etude sur la cénobitisme Pakhômien pendant le IV^e^ siècle et la première moitié du V^e^, Paris, 1898. The oldest Life of Pachomius was written in Greek, soon after 386 according to *Ladeuze,* and in the form in which it appears in the Bollandists, in the Acta SS. *Mai.,* iii. 25 ff. There is a Greek recension of Pachomius's rule in Palladius (l. c.), also in *Sozomenus,* Hist. eccl., iii. 14. A longer Greek recension (50 rules) is found in Acta SS. *Mai.,* iii. 62—63 (Latin pp. 346—347), and in *Migne,* PG., xl. 947—952. A still longer Greek recension (60 rules) was published by *Pitra,* Analecta sacra et classica (1888), i. 113—115. The Latin text in St. Jerome (l. c.) includes as many as 194 rules. For Ethiopic Regulae Pachomii cf. *A. Dillmann,* Chrestomathia Aethiopica, Leipzig, 1866,

[1] Historia Lausiaca, c. 38. [2] *Migne,* PL., xxiii. 61—86.
[3] Ib., xxiii. 85—99.

pp. 57—69; this text has been translated into German by *E. König,* in Theol. Studien und Kritiken (1878), li. 323—337. Some Coptic sermons attributed to Pachomius were published by *E. Amélineau,* with a French version, in the Mémoires publiés par les membres de la mission archéologique française au Caire (1895), iv. 2, 483 ff. *E. Preuschen,* Mönchtum und Serapiskult, Giessen, 1903. On St. Pachomius and his monks see *M. Heimbucher,* Die Orden und Kongregationen der katholischen Kirche, Paderborn, 1896, i. 36 ff.

3. ST. ORSISIUS (ORSIESIUS) AND ST. THEODORUS. — Petronius, the successor of Pachomius in the government of his monastic community, survived him but a few days. His place was filled by Orsisius or Orsiesius (§ 63, 6), who chose as his assistant the monk Theodorus. The latter died in 368, the death of Orsisius took place about 380. Jerome[1] has added to the letters of Pachomius (§ 64, 2) a brief letter of Theodorus *Ad omnia monasteria de pascha.* Gennadius[2] knew several letters of Theodorus. Orsisius wrote a *Doctrina de institutione monachorum*[3] that won warm praise from Gennadius[4]; it was probably written in Coptic, but is known to us only in a Latin version which is very probably the work of Saint Jerome. A *Libellus de sex cogitationibus sanctorum*[5] in Latin goes under the name of Orsisius.

On Orsisius and Theodorus the reader may consult the works of Grützmacher and Ladeuze quoted above (no. 2). With the Coptic Sermons of Pachomius, Amélineau published (l. c.) Coptic Sermons of Theodorus and Coptic Letters of Orsisius, with a French version.

4. SS. MACARIUS THE EGYPTIAN AND MACARIUS THE ALEXANDRINE. — Rufinus[6] and Palladius[7] dwell with special pleasure on the wonderful deeds of Macarius the Egyptian and Macarius the Alexandrine. The former was born about the year 300, and when about thirty years of age, retired to the solitude of Scete, where he dwelt for sixty years. At the end of his first decade in the desert he was ordained priest, and because of his rapid progress in virtue was soon known as «the aged youth», *παιδαριογέρων.* His sanctity was made evident by remarkable gifts of prophecy and by power over the demons and by the healing of the sick. These gifts were possessed in a still higher degree by his somewhat younger contemporary, Macarius of Alexandria. He was also a priest and had charge of a monastery (or the monasteries?) in the Nitrian desert, then the principal centre of Egyptian monasticism. He died about 395, and was henceforth known as «the Alexandrine»[8] or also «the town's man»[9] from the place of his birth and to distinguish him from his

[1] *Migne,* PL., xxiii. 99 100.
[2] De viris ill., c. 8.
[3] *Migne,* PG., xl. 869—894.
[4] De viris ill., c. 9.
[5] *Migne,* PG., xl. 895—896.
[6] Vitae Patrum, cc. 28 29.
[7] Hist. Lausiaca, c. 19 20.
[8] *Socr.,* Hist. eccl., iv. 23.
[9] *Sozom.,* Hist. eccl., iii. 14.

illustrious namesake who was born in Upper Egypt. It is only in our own time that he came to be known as «Macarius Junior» In Sozomen[1] and Nicephorus Callistus[2] it is another Egyptian monk[3] who is called «the younger» *(ὁ νέος)*. The ancient biographers are silent about any writings of the two Macarii. Gennadius[4] mentions only one didactic letter of «the celebrated Egyptian monk Macarius» to younger monks: *Macarius monachus ille Aegyptius. unam tantum ad iuniores professionis suae scripsit epistolam*. At a later date we meet with a great number of works attributed to one or other of these holy men. Fifty «spiritual» homilies i. e. dealing with the spiritual life, bear the name of Macarius the Egyptian *(ὁμιλίαι πνευματικαί*[5]*)*, also an *Epistola magna et perutilis*[6] first edited by Floss (1850). The homilies, the authenticity of which we have no reason to suspect, were much admired at a later period; their author ranks as a foremost representative of the earliest ecclesiastical mysticism. The following treatises: *De custodia cordis, De perfectione in spiritu, De oratione. De patientia et discretione, De elevatione mentis, De charitate, De libertate mentis*[7], published by Possinus (1683) as works of Macarius the Egyptian, are really excerpts from the «Spiritual homilies», made probably in the tenth century by Simeon Logotheta. There is also current under the name of Macarius an apparently spurious *Sermo de exitu animae iustorum et peccatorum, quomodo separantur a corpore et in quo statu manent*[8] Several short collections of «sentences» *(apophthegmata)*[9] are usually attributed to «Macarius the Egyptian abbot». A short prayer[10], three Latin letters[11] and a Latin *Regula ad monachos*[12], are ascribed in the manuscripts to «Saint Macarius». A Latin discourse that bears the name of Macarius the Alexandrine is probably spurious.

In *Migne* (PG., xxxiv) several «Dissertationes» are added to the works described in the preceding paragraph, among them the «Quaestiones criticae et historicae de Macariorum Aegyptii et Alexandrini vitis», in *Floss*, Macarii Aegyptii epistolae, homiliarum loci, preces, primus edidit Fl., Cologne, 1850, pp. 1—188. *M. Jocham* published (Sulzbach, 1839, 2 vols.) a German translation of the works of «St. Macarius the Great». Another translation was published at Kempten, 1878 (Bibliothek der Kirchenväter). The spiritual doctrine of Macarius is discussed by *Th. Förster*, Makarius von Ägypten, in Jahrb. f. deutsche Theol. (1873), xviii. 439—501. The two fragments which *Floss* published at Bonn (Universitätsprogramm zum 3. Aug. 1866) under the name of Macarius (the Egyptian) belong, as was pointed out by *Gildemeister*, to a work printed among the writings of Saint Ephræm, in the Greek section of the Roman edition of Ephræm (1732

[1] Ib., vi. 29. [2] Hist. eccl., xi. 35. [3] *Pallad.*, Hist. Laus., c. 17.
[4] De viris ill., c. 10. [5] *Migne*, PG., xxxiv. 449—822.
[6] Ib., xxxiv. 409—442. [7] Ib., xxxiv. 821—968.
[8] Ib., xxxiv. 385—392. [9] Ib., xxxiv. 229—264.
[10] Ib., xxxiv. 445—448. [11] Ib., xxxiv. 405—410 441—446.
[12] Ib. xxxiv. 967—970.

to 1746), i. 41 B—61 F). *J. Gildemeister,* Über die an der k. preuss. Universität Bonn entdeckten neuen Fragmente des Makarius, Leipzig, 1866. *H. J. Floss,* J. Gildemeister und das Bonner Universitätsprogramm zum 3. Aug. 1866, Freiburg, 1867 *J. Gildemeister,* Über die in Bonn entdeckten neuen Fragmente des Makarius, zweites Wort, Elberfeld, 1867 *R. Löbe,* Makarius von Ägypten, in Kirchl. Jahrb. für das Herzogtum Sachsen-Altenburg (1900), vi 1, 37—78.

5. ST. ISAIAS. — An abbot Isaias, who lived according to the common opinion in the fourth century and in the desert of Scete, is held to be the author of twenty-nine *Orationes* the text of which has reached us only in a Latin version[1]; some fragments of the Greek text are in the *Capitula de religiosa exercitatione et quiete*[2]. Sixty-eight *Praecepta seu consilia posita tironibus in monachatu*[3] are extant only in Latin. Some fragments are found in Migne[4].

According to *G. Krüger* (*Ahrens* und *Krüger,* Die sog. Kirchengeschichte des Zacharias Rhetor, Leipzig, 1899, pp. 385 f.), the author of the above-mentioned works was the ascetic Isaias who died between 485 and 490, and found a biographer in the rhetorician Zacharias (§ 103, 2).

### § 65. Anti-Manichæan writers.

1. HEGEMONIUS. — Towards the end of the third century Manichæism began to make its way from Persia into the Greco-Roman world and to popularize its system of two eternal principles, one good the other evil, and of the origin of the works of creation from a commingling of light and darkness. The literary opposition of the Christians began, apparently, with the author of the *Acta disputationis Archelai episcopi Mesopotamiae et Manetis haeresiarchae,* a work that has reached us only in an ancient Latin translation made from a Greek text. This Greek text some fragments of which are extant, probably represent its primitive form; others maintain that it was originally written in Syriac; at all events it belongs to the first half of the fourth century According to the trustworthy evidence of Heraclian of Chalcedon[5] the author was a certain Hegemonius. The work contains the narrative of a dispute between Archelaus, bishop of Charchar (probably Carrhæ-Harran) in Mesopotamia, and the founder of Manichæism, held in presence of learned arbiters who decided in favor of Archelaus; a second dispute likewise ended in a splendid victory for the bishop. These disputes are doubtlessly imaginary events, a literary form invented for the purpose of exhibiting the arguments of the author against Manichæism. There is no evidence for the historical reality of this bishop Archelaus or of any of the personages brought forward, with the sole exception of Mani. The work is nevertheless a valuable source of information

[1] *Migne,* PG., xl. 1105—1206.
[2] Ib., xl. 1205—1212.
[3] *Migne,* PL., ciii. 427—434.
[4] *Migne,* PG., xl. 1211—1214.
[5] *Phot.,* Bibl. Cod. 85.

to historians and dogmatic theologians; the writer had before him genuine Manichæan writings parts of which he quotes, and his description of the Manichæan system is the common source of all later Greek and Latin works on that subject.

A complete Latin text of the Acta disputationis was first edited by *L. A. Zacagni*, Collectanea monumentorum veterum eccles. gr. ac lat., Rome, 1698, pp. 1—105; often reprinted since, as e. g. in *Migne*, PG., x. 1405—1528. *H. v. Zittwitz*, Acta disputationis Archelai et Manetis, untersucht, in Zeitschr. f. die hist. Theol. (1873), xliii. 467—528. *Ad. Oblasinski*, Acta disputationis Archelai et Manetis (Diss. inaug.), Leipzig, 1874. *K. Kessler*, Mani, Berlin, 1889, i. 87—171 «Sprache und Komposition der Acta Archelai». *Th. Nöldeke*, in Zeitschr. der deutschen Morgenländ. Gesellschaft (1889), xliii. 537—541, contested *Kessler's* theory of a Syriac original. *C. Salemann*, Ein Bruchstück manichäischen Schrifttums im asiatischen Museum, in Mémoires de l'Acad. imp. des sciences de St. Pétersbourg, Leipzig, 1904.

2. ALEXANDER OF LYCOPOLIS. — In the first half of the fourth century a certain Alexander Lycopolites, from Lycopolis in the Thebais, wrote a work against the Manichæans. Notwithstanding its brevity and its rude and obscure diction it has always been esteemed as helpful evidence to the character of Manichæan teaching. Photius[1] calls him a bishop of Lycopolis; he was probably neither a bishop nor a Christian, but a heathen and a Platonist.

The work of Alexander is edited by *Fr. Combefis*, Bibl. Graec. Patr. auctarium novissimum, Paris, 1672, ii. 3—21, and reprinted in *Migne*, PG., xviii. 409—448. *A. Brinkmann* has published a very accurate edition of the text, Leipzig, 1895; on the personality and date of this writer see *Brinkmann* in his edition, Praef., pp. xii ff.

3. ST. SERAPION OF THMUIS. — According to St. Jerome[2] Serapion, bishop of Thmuis in Lower Egypt and a faithful companion of Athanasius in his conflicts and sufferings who for his learning was known as Scholasticus (died after 362), wrote *Adversum Manichaeum egregium librum et de Psalmorum titulis alium et ad diversos utiles epistolas*. Two of these letters were published by Cardinal Mai: one a short consolatory letter to the bishop Eudoxius, the other a letter of encouragement to some monks of Alexandria. Wobbermin discovered and edited a dogmatic letter «on the Father and the Son» *(περὶ πατρὸς καὶ υἱοῦ)*. The work of Serapion on the titles of the Psalms seems to have perished. His treatise against the Manichæans is extant, and fragments of it have been reprinted from time to time. We owe to Brinkmann (1894) the restoration of the original form of the work. In this shape it is really an excellent composition; the most important propositions of Manichæism are refuted not only with vigor but with much spirit and acumen.

[1] Contra Manichaeos, i. 11. [2] De viris ill., c. 99.

The work of Serapion against the Manichæans and the similar work of Titus of Bostra (see no. 4) have reached us through one (Genoese) manuscript of the eleventh century; cf. *Pitra,* Analecta sacra et classica (1888), part 1, pp. 44—46. There is a copy of this codex in the City Library of Hamburg; cf. *de Lagarde,* Titi Bostreni quae ex opere contra Manichaeos edito in codice Hamburgensi servata sunt graece, e recogn. P. A. de L., Berlin, 1859, iii. By reason of the blundering insertion of a 4^to^ leaf in this codex, and consequently in the copy, three fourths of the work of Serapion were made to pass as the production of Titus. *De Lagarde* (l. c.) was the first to separate this interpolation from the book of the bishop of Bostra, while Brinkmann was the first to recognize this part as belonging to the work of Serapion (Sitzungsberichte der k. preuss. Akad. d. Wissensch. zu Berlin, 1894, pp. 479—491). Previously *J. Dräseke* (Gesammelte Patrist. Untersuchungen, Altona and Leipzig, 1889, pp. 1—24) fancied he saw in this interpolated text the remnants of a work by the Macedonian George of Laodicea (§ 61, 2). *J. Basnage,* Thesaurus monumentorum eccl. et hist., Antwerp, 1725, i. 35—55, edited the work from the Hamburg manuscript, and his edition was reprinted in *Migne,* PG., xl. 899—924. We owe to *Pitra,* l. c., pp. 48—49, a collation of this manuscript with the Genoese codex. The two letters edited by Mai (see no. 3) are reprinted in *Migne,* PG., xl. 923—942. The dogmatic letter and thirty liturgical prayers, the first and fifteenth of which are the work of Serapion, were edited by *G. Wobbermin,* in Texte und Untersuchungen, Leipzig, 1898, xvii, new series, ii. 3b. This Euchologium was also studied by *P. Drews,* in Zeitschrift f. Kirchengeschichte (1900), xx. 291—328 415—441. A new edition was published by *F. E. Brightman,* in Journal of Theological Studies (1899—1900), i. 88—113 247—277 It is given with a Latin translation in *Funk,* Didascalia, ii. («Testimonia») 158—195. There are a few words «from the twenty-third letter of Saint Serapion», in *Pitra,* Analecta sacra (1884), ii. Proleg. XL; Analecta sacra et classica (1888), part 1, p. 47. In *Pitra,* Analecta sacra (1883), iv 214—215 443—444, *P. Martin* published three brief Syriac fragments attributed to Serapion, ex homilia de virginitate, ex epistola ad episcopos confessores and a sentence «incerti loci».

4. TITUS OF BOSTRA. — Titus, bishop of Bostra in Arabia (Hauran), and well-known for his relations with Julian the Apostate, († ca. 374)[1], was a younger contemporary of Serapion of Thmuis. He has left us a work in four books against the Manichæans, that became deservedly famous at a later date. The first two books are a philosophico-dialectic attack on the Manichæan dualism, while in the other two books he uses biblico-theological arguments. The work has a special historical value by reason of the numerous literal quotations from Manichæan writings. The only extant codex of the Greek text contains but the first two books and a small portion of the third. The work has reached us entire in a Syriac version, published (1859) by de Lagarde from a manuscript of the year 411. Some homily-like fragments of a commentary on St. Luke have also been preserved. The genuineness of an *Oratio in ramos palmarum* is very doubtful.

[1] *Sozom*, Hist. eccl. v. 15.

For the manuscript-tradition of the Greek text of the work against the Manichæans see no. 3. All former editions were made from the Hamburg copy: *Basnage,* l. c., i. 56—162; *Migne,* PG., xviii. 1069—1264; *de Lagarde,* l. c. *Pitra* printed a collation of the Genoese manuscript, in Analecta sacra et classica (1888), part. 1, pp. 50—63. With the aid of the Syriac version Lagarde proved (l. c., iii.) that a long section (from the work of Serapion against the Manichees) had erroneously been inserted in the first book of the work of Titus: Titi Bostreni contra Manichaeos libri quatuor syriace, *P. A. de Lagarde* ed., Berlin, 1859. The commentary on the Gospel of Saint Luke, edited as a work of Titus by Fronto Ducæus in 1624 (reprinted in Magna Bibl. vet. Patr., Paris, 1644, xiii. 762—836) is only a Catena-like compilation that cannot be of an earlier date than the sixth century. The fragments of the genuine commentary were edited by *J. Sickenberger,* Leipzig, 1901, in Texte und Untersuchungen, new series, vi. 1. *Id.,* Titus von Bostra, Studien zu dessen Lukashomilien (Inaug.-Diss.), Leipzig, 1900; Über griechische Evangelienkommentare, in Biblische Zeitschrift (1903), i. 182—193. The Oratio in ramos palmarum is in *Migne,* l. c., 1263—1278. For a Syriac fragment of a sermon on the Epiphany attributed to Titus of Bostra see *de Lagarde,* Anmerkungen zur griechischen Übersetzung der Proverbien, Leipzig, 1863, pp. 94—95.

5. OTHER ANTI-MANICHÆAN WRITERS. — To this period belong also the anti-Manichæan writers Basil the Great (§ 67, 4), Didymus the Blind (§ 70, 2; cf. § 69, 11), and Diodorus of Tarsus (§ 72, 2).

### § 66. St. Cyril of Jerusalem.

1. HIS LIFE. — The birthplace of St. Cyril (ca. 315) is unknown; he was educated at Jerusalem. About 345 he was ordained priest by Maximus II., bishop of Jerusalem, and in that capacity delivered in 347 or 348 his famous catechetical instructions to the candidates for baptism and the neophytes. After the death of St. Maximus he was chosen (350 or 351) to succeed him. His latest biographer Mader (1891) contends that Cyril was already a bishop in 347 or 348, and as such delivered the Catechetical discourses in 348. For a long time Cyril displayed an attitude of reserve towards the contemporary dogmatic controversies. In his «Catecheses» he frequently opposes Arianism, but without speaking of Arius or the Arians, and without once mentioning the ὁμοούσιος although he decidedly taught the consubstantiality of Father and Son. Nevertheless, he was later on the object of much hostility and persecution on the part of the Arians. They began with a conflict that arose between Cyril and Acacius, the Arian bishop of Cæsarea (§ 61, 1) apropos of the seventh canon of the Council of Nicæa which acknowledged in the bishop of Jerusalem a primacy of honor, without detriment of the metropolitan rights of Cæsarea. It was really the confessor and defender of the Nicene faith whom the Arians attacked on this occasion. He was three times expelled from his see; the third exile lasted eleven years (367—378). In 381 he assisted at the (Second Ecumenical) Council of Constantinople. It is generally believed that he died March 18., 386.

2. THE CATECHESES. — They are 23 (24) in number[1] and present a complete body of doctrine. The first 18 (19) are addressed to the candidates for baptism, *φωτιζόμενοι*, and were delivered during the Lenten season. The introductory discourse, *προκατήχησις*, treats of the greatness and importance of the grace about to be bestowed upon his auditors. The first catechesis is a short and summary repetition of the principal truths of the procatechesis. The second treats of sin and penance, the third of the meaning and effects of baptism, the fourth of the outlines of Christian faith, and the fifth of the nature and origin of the theological virtue of faith. The following catecheses (6—18) contain a continuous exposition and demonstration of every word and every sentence in the Creed as recited at baptism according to the Jerusalem ritual. At Easter the catechumens were baptized, they also received Confirmation and the Holy Eucharist. It is to the newly baptized Christians, *νεοφώτιστοι*, that the five concluding catecheses are addressed; they were delivered in Easter week and are much shorter than the preceding instructions. They aim at making known to all hearers the mysteries of Christianity, hence they are called *κατηχήσεις μυσταγωγικαί*, and offer complete instruction, based on the liturgical ceremonies, concerning Baptism (19—20), Confirmation (21) and the Holy Eucharist (22—23). These catecheses have always been considered models of their kind. Their diction is simple and clear, and the entire exposition is mildly grave, tranquil and cordial. Their subject-matter causes them to be looked on as one of the most precious treasures of Christian antiquity; the five mystagogical catecheses, in particular, are of incalculable value for the history of doctrine and the liturgy. The doubts once entertained by Protestant scholars as to the genuineness of all or, at least, the mystagogical catecheses, were suggested by sectarian narrowness and have long since disappeared. Cyril bears witness to the Real Presence of Christ in the Blessed Eucharist in the following words «In the figure of bread, *ἐν τύπῳ ἄρτου*, is given to thee the Body, and in the figure of wine the Blood, so that, when thou receivest the Body and Blood of Christ, thou mayest become of one body and one blood with Him, *σύσσωμος καὶ σύναιμος αὐτοῦ*; for thus we shall become Christ-bearers, *χριστοφόροι*, when His Body and His Blood are distributed in our members» (Cat. xxii. 9). «What appears to be bread is not bread, although it seems thus to the taste, but it is the Body of Christ, and what appears to be wine is not wine, although the taste judges thus, but it is the Blood of Christ» (Cat. xxii. 9). This Real Presence is brought about by a changing *(μεταβάλλειν)* of the substance of the bread and the wine into the substance of the Body and Blood of Christ. «At Cana in Galilee He once changed water into wine which is akin to blood: and shall not we believe Him when He changes

[1] *Migne*, PG., xxxiii.

wine into blood?» (Cat. xxii. 2). «We beseech the good God to send down the Holy Spirit upon the gifts that lie before us *(τὰ προκείμενα)*, and thereby make the bread the Body of Christ and the wine the Blood of Christ; for whatever the Holy Spirit touches is completely sanctified and changed» (Cat. xxiii. 7). We select the following words from his description and explanation of the sacrifice of the Mass: «After the completion of the spiritual sacrifice of the Mass, after the completion of the unbloody worship (i. e. after the consecration) we pray to God over this oblation of propitiation for the general peace of the churches we all pray and offer this sacrifice for every one who is in need of help. We remember those who have already gone before us, first the patriarchs, the prophets, the apostles and the martyrs, so that through their prayers and intercession God may look graciously upon our petitions; thereupon we pray for the deceased holy fathers and bishops, and indeed for all our departed, since we believe that our prayers offered in the presence of this holy and worshipful sacrifice will be of the greatest utility to these souls we offer up Christ slain for our sins in order to obtain pardon from the good God for them (the departed) and for ourselves» (Cat. xxiii. 8—10).

3. OTHER WRITINGS. — We possess, moreover, from the pen of Cyril, a homily on the paralytic (John v 5) delivered about 345 [1], a letter to the Emperor Constantius on the miraculous apparition at Jerusalem of a great shining cross (May 7., 351) [2], and three brief homiletic fragments [3] A homily on the feast of Hypapante, or Purification of the Blessed Virgin [4], and other writings, are wrongly attributed to him.

4. LITERATURE. — The best edition of the works of Cyril is that of the Benedictine *A. A. Touttée* († 1718), Paris, 1720; Venice, 1763 (*Migne*, PG., xxxiii). The edition of *W. K. Reischl* and *J. Rupp* (Munich, 1848 to 1860, 2 vols.) is excellent and handy. *Nolte* contributed some pages of text- criticism, in Theol. Quartalschr. (1862), xliv. 308—316. The latest edition is that of *Photius Alexandrides*, with notes by *Dionysius Kleophas*, Jerusalem, 1867—1868, 2 vols. See *Risi*, Di una nuova edizione delle opere di S. Cirillo Geros., Rome, 1884. An Armenian (incomplete) edition of the Catecheses was published at Vienna in 1832. They were translated into German by *J. Nirschl*, Kempten, 1871 (Bibliothek der Kirchenväter). There is an English translation of the Saint's writings by *E. H. Gifford*, in «A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church», New York, 1894, sect. II, vol. vii. *J. Th. Plitt*, De Cyrilli Hierosolymitani orationibus quae exstant catecheticis, Heidelberg, 1855. *Ph. Gonnet*, De S. Cyrilli Hierosolymitani archiepiscopi catechesibus, Paris, 1876. *J. Marquardt*, S. Cyrilli Hierosolymitani de contentionibus et placitis Arianorum sententia, Brunsberg, 1881; *Id.*, S. Cyrillus Hierosolymitanus baptismi, chrismatis, eucharistiae mysteriorum interpres,

[1] Ib., xxxiii. 1131—1154. [2] Ib., xxxiii. 1165—1176.
[3] Ib., xxxiii. 1181—1182. [4] Ib., xxxiii. 1187—1204.

Leipzig, 1882. *V Schmitt,* Die Verheissung der Eucharistie (St. John c. vi) bei den Antiochenern Cyrillus von Hierusalem und Joh. Chrysostomus, Würzburg, 1903. *A. Knappitsch,* S. Cyrilli episc. Hierosol. catechesibus quae principia et praecepta moralia contineantur (Progr.), Graz, 1899. *G. Delacroix,* St. Cyrille de Jérusalem, sa vie et ses œuvres, Paris, 1865. *J Mader,* Der hl. Cyrillus, Bischof von Jerusalem, in seinem Leben und seinen Schriften, Einsiedeln, 1891.

5. GELASIUS OF CÆSAREA. SOPHRONIUS. — Gelasius, bishop of Cæsarea (ca. 367—395), son of a sister of Saint Cyril of Jerusalem, left some writings that have perished. See *E. Venables,* in *Smith* and *Wace,* A Dictionary of Christian Biography, ii. 621. — The writings of Sophronius, a resident in Palestine perhaps at Bethlehem, and a friend of St. Jerome (De viris ill., c. 134), have also perished (cf. § 2, 1). Papadopulos-Kerameus published in the Ἀνάλεκτα ἱεροσολυμιτικῆς σταχυολογίας v, St. Petersburg, 1898, a Greek life of the famous monk St. Hilarion; he considers it an enlargement of Sophronius' Greek translation of Jerome's Vita beati Hilarionis (§ 93, 6).

### § 67. St. Basil the Great.

1. THE YOUTH OF BASIL. — SS. Basil, Gregory of Nazianzus, and Gregory of Nyssa are a splendid constellation in the heaven of the Church of Cappadocia. «In this trinity», it has been said, «are concentrated all the rays of that brilliant epoch of Christianity» Basil was born at Cæsarea in Cappadocia, probably in 331, in a family no less renowned for its Christian piety than for its nobility and riches. From earliest youth his heart and mind were cultivated with watchful care. He was an object of particular solicitude to his grandmother Macrina, a woman of rare refinement and profoundly religious spirit. She took charge of him almost in infancy, and accustomed him gradually to the restraints of a wise discipline, while she planted deep in his heart the teachings of St. Gregory Thaumaturgus[1]. His elementary training he received from his father Basil, a highly respected rhetorician of Neocæsarea in Pontus. The talented youth sought higher education, first in his native Cæsarea, then at Constantinople, and afterwards at Athens. In this last city he entered into intimate relations with Gregory of Nazianzus whom he had already known at Cæsarea. The two young friends were industrious and persevering, hence they made rapid progress in rhetoric, grammar and philosophy. But that Athens which failed, even in the beginning, to satisfy thoroughly the heart of our Basil, could not hope to make a deeper impression on him as time went by. After a stay of four or five years he returned to his native city in 359. Before long he had resolved to abandon his home, to renounce the brilliant career that lay before him at Cæsarea and Neocæsarea, and to embrace a life of asceticism. «I had wasted much time on follies», he wrote in 375, «and spent nearly all my youth in vain labors, and devotion to the teachings of a wisdom that God had made foolish (1 Cor. 1. 20).

[1] *Basil.,* Ep. 204, n. 6.

Suddenly I awoke as out of a deep sleep; I beheld the wonderful light of the Gospel truth, and I recognized the nothingness of the wisdom of the princes of this world that was come to naught (1 Cor. ii. 6). I shed a flood of tears over my wretched life, and I prayed for a guide who might form in me the principles of piety[1].»

2. BASIL AS MONK AND PRIEST. — After his baptism by Dianius, metropolitan of Cæsarea, Basil journeyed through Syria and Egypt in order to see with his own eyes the life of the monks in those lands. His travels gave him ample opportunities of studying at first hand the dogmatic questions that were then rending the Christian East. On his return he divided his fortune among the poor and began, not far from Neocæsarea, a life entirely devoted to God. He preferred the cenobitic system or the cloistered life in common[2], to the anchorite or hermit life; his teaching and example were so powerful that Rufinus could feel justified in saying[3] that in a short time all Pontus had put on another appearance: *Brevi permutata est totius provinciae facies.*

Gregory of Nazianzus was often a sojourner in this Pontic desert, and aided Basil in the formation of a rule for the monasteries that soon arose on all sides. They also published a selection from the works of Origen, Ὠριγένους φιλοκαλία, the result of their common industry (§ 39, 2). About 364 Eusebius, metropolitan of Cæsarea, the successor of Dianius, persuaded Basil to enter the priesthood and to return to the episcopal city. With the elevation of Valens to the imperial throne (July, 364), Arianism got a fresh lease of life; attempts were soon made to win over the faithful of Cæsarea, whose bishop was not only metropolitan of Cappadocia, but also exarch of the Pontic «diocese», one of the five «dioceses» or chief political divisions of the Roman East (praefectura Orientis). These were days of danger for Eusebius who was not a skilled theologian; and what the services of Basil meant, is well-expressed by Gregory of Nazianzus[4]: «He was all in all to him, a good counsellor, a skilful helper, an expounder of the Scriptures, an interpreter of his duties, the staff of his old age, the prop of his faith, more trustworthy than all his clerics, more experienced than any layman.» For the rest, Basil led at Cæsarea the same ascetic life as in his Pontic cloister. In 368 a great famine visited Cappadocia, and Basil devoted to the support of the poor the fortune that had fallen to him on the death of his mother Emmelia.

3. BASIL, METROPOLITAN OF CÆSAREA. — Eusebius died in 370, and Basil was chosen to succeed him, an election strongly favored by Gregory of Nazianzus and his father, the bishop of that city Basil justified their faith in him. His first care was to reform cer-

[1] Ep. 223, n. 2. [2] *Basil.*, Regulae fusiores, n. 7.
[3] Hist. eccl., ii. 9. [4] Orat. 43, in laudem Basil. M., n. 33.

tain abuses in the life of his clergy, to arrange and improve the liturgy, and to open places of refuge for suffering humanity. In 371 the province of Cappadocia was divided and two capitals were created, Cæsarea and Tyana, whereupon grievous discord arose between Basil and Anthimus, bishop of Tyana, concerning the limits of their jurisdiction. He had to put up with suspicion and reproach for his mildness and patience during many years in dealing with the double-tongued Eustathius, bishop of Sebaste. He attempted frequently, but in vain, to heal the Meletian schism at Antioch. His chief concern, however, was the overthrow of Arianism. Amid all the dark storms of the time he towered like a beacon-light showing the haven of safety to all who were of good will. All the onslaughts of heresy fell powerless before him, whether they came as violence and threats, or as flattery and deception, or as cunning dialectic and delusive exegesis. After Athanasius, it was to Basil that the East owed the restoration of peace, as soon as external conditions permitted it. He lived to see at least the dawning of better days. On January 1., 379, his soul quitted its bodily tenement, which had long been withering and wasting away.

4. DOGMATICO-POLEMICAL WRITINGS. — Basil left many writings, dogmatic, exegetic and ascetic, together with homilies and letters. The extant dogmatic writings are devoted to the overthrow of Arianism. The work against Eunomius (§ 61, 1) *Ἀνατρεπτικὸς τοῦ Ἀπολογητικοῦ τοῦ δυσσεβοῦς Εὐνομίου*[1] must have been composed about 363 or 364. He begins by calling attention to the fact that the very title of his adversary's work, *Ἀπολογητικὸς*, bewrays a deceitful purpose; he is desirous to appear as writing in self-defence, whereas he himself is the attacking party. Thereupon, he deals in the first book with two principal contentions of Eunomius, viz., that not to be begotten, *τὸ ἀγέννητον εἶναι*, is the very essence of God, and that in this concept of unbegotten being the nature of God is known (comprehended) in a perfectly adequate manner. Basil maintains that unbegotten being, in the sense of uncreated being, is only an attribute of the divinity: *ἐγὼ δὲ τὴν μὲν οὐσίαν τοῦ θεοῦ ἀγέννητον εἶναι καὶ αὐτὸς ἂν φαίην· οὐ μὴν τὸ ἀγέννητον τὴν οὐσίαν*[2]. He maintains, moreover, that the comprehension of the divine nature surpasses not only human capacity, but all created capacity whatsoever: *οἶμαι δὲ οὐκ ἀνθρώπους μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ πᾶσαν λογικὴν φύσιν ὑπερβαίνειν αὐτῆς* — sc. *τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ θεοῦ* — *τὴν κατάληψιν*[3]. The second book is devoted to the defence of the consubstantiality of the Son. The essential attribute of uncreatedness is not annulled by generation from the Father which is the proper distinctive mark of the person of the Son. Although begotten, the Son has never had a begin-

[1] *Migne*, PG., xxix. 497—773. [2] Adv. Eun., i. 11. [3] Ib., i. 14.

ning; it is from all eternity that He receives from the Father His divine nature, hence is He consubstantial with the Father and co-eternal. In the third book Basil refutes the objections of Eunomius against the divinity of the Holy Spirit. The two following books are also devoted to the defence of the consubstantiality of the Son and the Holy Spirit, but they have reached us in an incomplete state, or as excerpts; very probably they do not belong to St. Basil but to Didymus the Blind (§ 70, 2). The work on the Holy Spirit *περὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος*[1], written about 375, treats also of the consubstantiality of the Son and the Holy Spirit with the Father. In public worship Basil had made use of the doxology: Glory be to the Father with the Son together with the Holy Spirit *(μετὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ σὺν τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἁγίῳ)*[2], maintaining that it was no less orthodox than the usual formula: Glory be to the Father through the Son in the Holy Spirit *(διὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ ἐν τῷ ἁγίῳ πνεύματι)*. In this work, dedicated to Amphilochius, bishop of Iconium, he justifies the former expression on the ground that equal honor with the Father belongs to both the Son and the Holy Spirit, because they are of one and the same nature with the Father. He wrote also, according to Saint Augustine[3], a *Liber adversus Manichaeos*, but it has not reached us.

5. EXEGETIC WRITINGS. — The place of honor among his exegetic writings belongs to the nine homilies on the Hexaemeron[4] (Gen. i. 1—26) and the fifteen homilies on particular Psalms[5]. The former were highly esteemed, even in antiquity, by both East and West. Although his diction is very elaborate, he nowhere departs from the literal sense and eschews all allegory. It does not appear that he ever published the treatise announced at the end of this work[6], namely: On man as the image of God. Two other homilies entitled *De hominis structura* and a third *De paradiso*[7], formerly attributed to Basil and held to be a part of those nine homilies, are spurious. The homilies on the Psalms were meant by the author to furnish, not so much an exegesis of the text as a moral application of the same to the needs of the hearer or reader. They begin after the following manner (Hom. in Ps. 1, n. 1): «The prophets teach one thing, the historical books another, still another is taught in the Law, and something else in the Sapiential Books. The Book of Psalms brings together what is most serviceable in all the others; it foretells the future, it recalls the past, it lays down the laws of life, it teaches us our duties, — in a word, it is a general treasury, *ταμιεῖον*, of excellent instructions.» There is no doubt as to the authenticity of the homilies on Psalms 1 7 14 (two homilies) 28 29 32 33 44 45 48 59

[1] *Migne*, PG., xxxii. 67—218. [2] De Spir. S., c. 1, n. 3.
[3] Contra Iulianum, i. 16. [4] *Migne*, PG., xxix. 3—208.
[5] Ib., xxix—xxx. [6] Hom. 9, n. 6. [7] *Migne*, PG., xxx.

61 114 115 (according to Greek numeration)[1], some other homilies on the Psalms[2] are spurious or doubtful[3]. The publication by Pitra (1888) of short fragments of Psalm-homilies attributed to Basil confirms the opinion that Basil wrote homilies on many, perhaps on all the Psalms. The diffuse commentary on Is. 1—16[4] is very imperfect in form and contents; though its origin is doubtful, yet it must be looked on as a contemporary work. Basil wrote also a commentary on Job which has perished, some of his exegetic homilies are in the collection referred to below (no. 7).

6. ASCETIC WRITINGS. — A group of writings attributed to Basil that has only gradually reached its actual size, is known as *Ἀσκητικά*[5] It opens with three short treatises (discourses or fragments of discourses), on the sublimity of the *militia Christi*, the excellency of the monastic life, *βίος τῶν μοναχῶν*, and the duties of a monk. Two other treatises on divine judgment, *περὶ κρίματος θεοῦ*, and on faith, *περὶ πίστεως*, are introductory to certain moral instructions, *τὰ ἠθικά*, or eighty rules, *ὅροι*. Each instruction is usually made up of several phrases, and each phrase is accompanied by pertinent passages of the New Testament. Basil insists first on the general Christian duties, and then on those of particular states in life. Two *λόγοι ἀσκητικοί*, of doubtful origin, serve as a link between these instructions and the two monastic rules of St. Basil: fifty-five longer rules, *ὅροι κατὰ πλάτος*, in number, and 313 shorter rules, *ὅροι κατ' ἐπιτομήν*. Both are drawn up in the shape of questions and answers. In the former rules the principles of the monastic life are set forth; in the latter the main object is their application to the daily life of the monk. No higher praise can be given to these rules, undoubtedly Basil's own work, than the fact of their universal reception in the East, and their survival to the present time as the principal monastic rule of the Greek Church (Basilians). The last two pieces in this group are punishments, *ἐπιτίμια*, for monks and nuns who violate the rule, and ascetic constitutions, *ἀσκητικαὶ διατάξεις*, i. e. comprehensive directions and suggestions for monks, neither is any longer accepted as genuine. The beautiful tractate on baptism, *περὶ βαπτίσματος*, in two books[6], is more ascetic than doctrinal in its contents, and is likewise of doubtful origin. Altogether inferior and certainly spurious is the work on the true purity of virgins: *περὶ τῆς ἐν παρθενίᾳ ἀληθοῦς ἀφθορίας*[7] To the Latin West and a later time belong the following texts, extant in Latin only: *De consolatione in adversis*[8], *De laude solitariae vitae*, and *Admonitio ad filium spiritualem*.

[1] *Migne*, PG., xxix. [2] Ib., xxx.
[3] Among them in *Migne*, PG., xxx. 104—106, also the homily to Ps. 115.
[4] *Migne*, PG., xxx. [5] Ib., xxxi. 619—1428. [6] Ib., xxxi. 1513—1628.
[7] Ib., xxx. 669—810. [8] Ib., xxxi. 1687—1704.

7 HOMILIES. LETTERS. «LITURGY». — The genuineness or spuriousness respectively of some «Homilies» attributed to Basil is a difficult question. It may be said at once that a collection of 24 homilies[1], dogmatico-exegetic, theologico-moral and hagiographical in contents, is looked on in a general way as authentic. Basil is reckoned among the greatest ecclesiastical orators of antiquity Perhaps the most brilliant specimen of his eloquence is the homily against usurers, *κατὰ τοκιζόντων*, printed among his exegetic homilies (see no. 5) as the second homily on Psalm 14[2]. None of the 24 homilies has attracted more universal attention and approval than the discourse (work) «to youths, as to how they shall best profit by the writings of the pagan authors», *πρὸς τοὺς νέους ὅπως ἂν ἐξ ἑλληνικῶν ὠφελοῖντο λόγων*[3]. The twenty-four «Moral discourses», *ἠθικοὶ λόγοι*[4], are a tenth-century compilation by Simeon Metaphrastes from the writings of Basil. The authenticity of the homily on *mulieres subintroductae, περὶ τῶν συνεισάκτων*[5], is disputed; but many other discourses, e. g. *De Spiritu Sancto (in sanctum baptisma), Hom. dicta in Lacizis, In S. Christi generationem* etc.[6] are very probably spurious. — The correspondence of Basil was highly esteemed. Gregory of Nazianzus tells us that he collected for a young friend (the) letters of St. Basil[7] In the Benedictine edition[8] there are 365 of these letters. Two thirds of them (47—291) belong to the period of his episcopal career, from 370 to 378. The chronological order of the Benedictine edition of the letters was challenged by Ernst (1896) but victoriously defended by Loofs (1898). Most of the letters describe in detail, from one stand-point or another, events and conditions in the Eastern Church, particularly in that of Cappadocia, and have always been looked on as a copious and important store of original materials for the history of that troubled period. Some of the letters deal directly with points of Trinitarian doctrine, and are occasionally so long that they may be regarded as treatises. The three so-called «Canonical letters» (188 199 217) addressed to Amphilochius, bishop of Iconium (see no. 4), and wrongly denied to be Basil's by some modern critics, contain minute ecclesiastical regulations concerning the penitential discipline; at a later date they acquired canonical authority through the entire East. The letters of Basil to his famous contemporary, the teacher and rhetorician Libanius, are undoubtedly spurious, as well as those of Libanius to Basil (335—359), the same may be said of the correspondence of the Saint with the emperor Julian (39 40 41 360). Dräseke holds the authenticity of the correspondence of Basil with Apollinaris of Laodicea (361—364), while Loofs

[1] Ib., xxxi. 163—618.
[2] Ib., xxix. 263—280.
[3] Ib., xxxi. 563—590.
[4] xxxii. 1115—1382.
[5] Ib., xxx. 811—828.
[6] Ib., xxxi. 1429—1514.
[7] *Greg. Naz.*, Ep. 53.
[8] *Migne*, PG., xxxii. 219—1110.

rejects the letters as forgeries. — The so-called «Liturgy of Saint Basil» [1] has reached us in the Greek text, and a Coptic translation of the same. It may be looked on as certain that Saint Basil did reduce to a fixed form and order the usual prayers and ceremonies of the Church of Cæsarea, and that in this process he curtailed and enlarged with more or less freedom. But it is no longer an easy matter to decide with what measure of exactness the actual «Liturgy» reproduces the dispositions and order of the holy bishop, all the more as the manuscripts of the «Liturgy», and even the earliest versions of the same, exhibit notable variations.

8. GREATNESS OF ST. BASIL. HIS RULE OF FAITH. — Basil was styled the Great even by his contemporaries, and he deserved the title for many reasons. He was great as an exponent of Christian doctrine and as a homilist, greater, however, in practical life, as a prelate of the Church and a man of deeds. We may justly say that of the three great Cappadocians Basil was the practical man, Gregory of Nazianzus the speaker and writer, Gregory of Nyssa the thinker. We have already referred to the merits and success of this great Saint as standard-bearer of the true faith, as patriarch of Oriental monasticism, and as ecclesiastical legislator. His writings against the heresies of his time are all devoted to the establishment of the traditional teachings of the Church. The formula *Fides praecedit intellectum* is occasionally stated by him as follows: «In all discussions concerning God it is faith that should lead the way (*πίστις ἡγείσθω τῶν περὶ θεοῦ λόγων*), faith and not evidence, faith that compels the intellect to assent with more power than the conclusions of reason, that faith which is the result of no geometrical necessity but of the workings of the Holy Spirit» [2]. It is tradition that fixes for us the contents of our faith. «We accept no new faith written out for us by others, nor do we proclaim the results of our own cogitation, lest mere human wisdom should be accounted the rule of faith; we communicate to all who question us that which the holy fathers have taught us» [3]. Only a portion of this tradition is found in the Scriptures. «With regard to the objection that there is no evidence for the doxology 'with the Holy Spirit' (*σὺν τῷ πνεύματι*, see no. 4) and that it is not found in Scripture, we answer as follows: in case nothing must be accepted except what is found in Scripture, this too must be rejected; but if it be true that the greater part of the mysteries, *τὰ πλεῖστα τῶν μυστικῶν*, are accepted by us, though they are not found in the Scriptures, we shall do well to accept this also with so many other elements of our belief. I maintain as apostolic teaching that we should hold fast to our traditions,

[1] *Migne,* PG., xxxi. 1629—1678. [2] Hom. in Ps. 115, n. 1.
[3] Ep. 140, n. 2.

even if they be not stated in the Scriptures». He then adduces the text of 1 Cor. xi. 2 and 2 Thess. ii. 15[1].

9. HIS TRINITARIAN DOCTRINE. — The Trinity is, naturally enough, the chief subject of the dogmatic writings of Basil. Against the Arians he maintains the unity of God, and against the Sabellians the trinity of persons in the Godhead: *μία οὐσία, τρεῖς ὑποστάσεις*. «In God», he writes to his brother Gregory[2], «there are at once a certain ineffable and incomprehensible community and distinction: the distinction of persons does not exclude the unity of nature, nor does the unity of nature destroy the proper and characteristic marks of distinction.» In the homily that he delivered against the Sabellians and Arius and the Anomœans[3] he says still more pointedly: «It is a shocking folly not to accept the teaching of our Lord who makes known to us with all clearness the distinction of persons (in the Trinity). 'For, when I go', says he[4] 'I will ask the Father, and He will give you another Paraclete' Therefore the Son prays, He prays to the Father, the Paraclete is sent. Is it not preposterous to hear 'I' predicated of the Son, 'He' of the Father, and 'Another' of the Holy Spirit, and yet to confound all three, to commingle them all, and to attribute to one thing, *ἑνί πράγματι*, all these qualifications? Do not imagine, on the other hand, that you may carry off as an impious booty the separation of the persons. Though they are two in number, they are, nevertheless, not different in nature, and he who speaks of two, does not thereby assert that they are separate. There is one God who (instead of *ὅτι* the text should read *ὅς*) is also Father, one God who is also Son; there are not two Gods, for the Son is identical in nature with the Father *(ἐπειδὴ ταυτότητα ἔχει ὁ υἱὸς πρὸς τὸν πατέρα)*. For I do not behold one divinity in the Father and another in the Son, nor different natures in both. In order therefore to make clear the distinction of persons, count the Father apart and the Son apart; but in order to avoid polytheism, confess that in both there exists absolute unity of nature. In this way Sabellius is cast down and the Anomœan is routed.» — Basil undertook repeatedly the defence of the *ὁμοουσία* or true divinity of the Holy Spirit, in forcible language and at much length, especially in the third book of his work *Adversus Eunomium* and in his work *De Spiritu Sancto*. The circumstances of the time were however very favorable to the Pneumatomachi, and this made Basil refrain for the most part from calling the Holy Spirit God; some of his fellow-Catholics were concerned about this and raised their voices in accusation against him. But he was defended by Gregory of Nazianzus[5]. «It is better», he says, «to exercise prudence in dealing with the truth, *οἰκονομεῖν τὴν ἀλήθειαν*, and to look upon the circumstances as a kind of overhanging

[1] De Spir. S., c. 29, n. 71. [2] Ep. 38, n. 4. [3] Hom. 24, n. 3.
[4] John xiv. 16. [5] Ep. 58.

cloud, than to do harm, *καταλύειν*, to the truth by an open profession of it.» He defended Basil elsewhere, after the same fashion[1] — The procession of the Holy Spirit is described, after the prevalent Greek manner of comprehension and expression, as a procession from the Father through the Son *(ἓν δὲ καὶ τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα δι' ἑνὸς υἱοῦ τῷ ἑνὶ πατρὶ συναπτόμενον*[2], and *τὸ βασιλικὸν ἀξίωμα ἐκ πατρὸς διὰ τοῦ μονογένους ἐπὶ τὸ πνεῦμα διήκει)*[3]. In the fifth book of his work *Adv. Eunomium* he says repeatedly that the Holy Spirit is *ἐκ θεοῦ δι' υἱοῦ*[4]. In the same work Adv. Eunomium, books 1—3, he even stands for the *filioque,* and not as a theological opinion but as certainly being a point of Christian revelation. Eunomius attributed to the Son alone, *τῷ μονογενεῖ μόνῳ*, the origin of the Holy Spirit, whereas Basil protested strongly, but readily granted that the Holy Spirit proceeds also from the Son[5]. A vigorous controversy arose between Greeks and Latins during the Council of Florence over the famous words of Basil[6], to the effect that the Spirit has His place after the Son, «because He holds from Him His being, and receives from Him and communicates to us, and depends completely from that origin»: *παρ' αὐτοῦ τὸ εἶναι ἔχον καὶ παρ' αὐτοῦ λαμβάνον καὶ ἀναγγέλλον ἡμῖν καὶ ὅλως τῆς αἰτίας ἐκείνης ἐξημμένον.* That these are the genuine original words of Basil is proved by good arguments, extrinsic and intrinsic. But even were they the words of a forger, their meaning is true: and the entire argument of Basil presupposes it as something logical and indispensable.

10. HOW SHALL WE KNOW GOD? — Eunomius also gave Basil occasion to treat of the manner in which man can know God. The former declared that the nature of God consisted in being unbegotten, *ἀγεννησία*; he insisted that this alone was expressive of the true nature of God (see no. 4). Basil insists that our knowledge of God is not immediate but mediate. «We contend that we know our God from His works, but we do not flatter ourselves that we understand His very nature; for His works descend to us from above, while His nature remains ever inaccessible.»[7] «Creatures show us the power and the wisdom and the skill of their Creator, but they cannot enable us to understand His nature. Indeed, they do not necessarily represent the extent of His might, for it may very well happen when the divine Artist produces a work, that He does not manifest all His power, but manifests it only in a limited way. But even though He did display it to the full, from His works we should know only His omnipotence and not the nature of His innermost being.»[8] Our human knowledge of God is therefore imperfect, but it is not a false knowledge of Him. It is easy to see that the principle of

[1] Orat. 41, n. 6; 43, n. 68. [2] De Spir. S., c. 18, n. 45. [3] Ib., n. 47.
[4] *Migne,* PG., xxix. 732 737. [5] Adv. Eun. 2, 34. [6] Ib., 3, 1.
[7] Ep. 234, n. 1. [8] Adv. Eun. 2, 32.

Eunomius: either we know God or we do not know Him, is by no means a correct statement of the question. If perfect comprehension and true knowledge were identical, we should have no true knowledge even of earthly things[1]. Even after His revelations of Himself we know God only after the manner in which the finite is able to grasp the infinite, *ὡς δυνατὸν γνωρίζεσθαι τὸν ἀπειρομεγέθη ὑπὸ τοῦ μικροτάτου*[2] Even in Paradise we shall not fully comprehend the nature of God. «Our knowledge of the divine nature is therefore nothing more than our realization of its incomprehensibility: *εἴδησις ἄρα τῆς θείας οὐσίας ἡ αἴσθησις αὐτοῦ τῆς ἀκαταληψίας*[3].

11. COMPLETE EDITIONS OF THE WORKS OF ST. BASIL. — The first complete edition of the original text was published at Basle in 1532 (reprinted Venice 1535, Basle 1551), and Paris, 1618, 3 vols., reprinted 1638. The Paris edition was the work of *Fronto Ducæus* (Fronton Du Duc, S. J.) and *F. Morellus;* critical notes were added to it by *Fr. Combefis,* O. Pr., in his: Basilius M. ex integro recensitus, Paris, 1679, 2 vols. By far the best edition is that of the Benedictines, Paris, 1721—1730, 3 vols. The first two volumes were edited (1721 and 1722) by *J. Garnier;* after his death (June 3., 1725) the third was edited by *Pr. Maran,* in 1730. The Latin version (not the Greek text) of this edition was reprinted at Venice, 1750—1751, 3 vols.; at Bergamo, 1793, 6 vols.; at Paris, 1835—1840, 3 vols. A second edition of the Benedictine text was published by *L. de Sinners,* Paris, 1839, 3 vols. (editio Parisina altera, emendata et aucta); some critical notes to the first vol. of this edition were contributed by *A. Jahnius,* Animadversiones in S. Basilii M. opera, supplementum editionis Garnerianae secundae, fasc. I: continens animadversiones in tom. i, Berne, 1842 (the Benedictine edition, with appendices, is found in *Migne,* PG., xxix—xxxii, Paris, 1857. The Migne text was reprinted at Athens, 1900 f., by Kaplanides. The two spurious Orationes de hominis structura (*Migne,* PG., xxx. 9—61) are found also among the works of Gregory of Nyssa (*Migne,* PG., xliv. 257—298) under the title: Orat. in Scripturae verba: Faciamus hominem ad imaginem et similitudinem nostram; they cannot, however, belong to that author. For the treatise De consolatione in adversis, see § 113, 3. The treatise De laude solitariae vitae is identical with Opusc. xi, c. 19 (Laus eremiticae vitae) among the works of St. Peter Damian, in *Migne,* PL., cxlv. 246—251. The Admonitio ad filium spiritualem is found among the works of St. Benedict of Aniane (ib., ciii. 683—700), but it is an extract from the Liber exhortationis, vulgo de salutaribus documentis (cc. 20—45) written by St. Paulinus of Aquileja († 802; *Migne,* l. c., xcix. 197—282); it is also found among the spurious works of St. Augustine (Ib., xl. 1047—1078).

12. SUPPLEMENTS TO THE COMPLETE EDITIONS. — *Chr. Fr. Matthæi,* in Glossaria Graeca minora, Moscow, 1774, also in his Ioannis Xiphilini et Basilii M. aliquot orationes, ib., 1775, published three homilies under the name of St. Basil. The first, De perfectione vitae monachorum, is identical with Ep. 22 (with the same title) of our Saint (*Migne,* PG., xxxii. 287—294); the second, De misericordia et iudicio, is at least of doubtful origin; the third, Homilia consolatoria ad aegrotum, is certainly spurious. The first and third are found in *Migne,* PG., xxxi. 1705—1722.

[1] For proof of this see specially Epp. 233—235. [2] Ep. 233, n. 2.
[3] Ep. 234, n. 2.

*A. Mai* published in his Nova Patrum Bibl., Rome, 1845, iii. part I, 449; part II, 281—282, an Epistola ad Urbicium monachum de continentia, that had escaped the Benedictines (*Migne*, PG., xxxii. 1109—1112), also (ib., 1853, vi, part II, 584) a Sermo de sacerdotum instructione (*Migne*, PG., xxxi. 1685—1688). An exposition of the Symbolum Nicaenum wrongly attributed to our Saint, was published by *C. P. Caspari*, Ungedruckte, unbeachtete und wenig beachtete Quellen zur Geschichte des Taufsymbols und der Glaubensregel, Christiania, 1869, ii. 4—7; cf. 13—30; it has not «the slightest resemblance», says Caspari (p. 27), to the symbol found in Basil's treatise περὶ πίστεως (no. 4, *Migne*, PG., xxxi. 685—688). Extracts from some letters of Basil, according to recently discovered papyri codices, were published by *H. Landwehr*, in Griechische Handschriften aus Fayyûm: Philologus (1884), xliii. 110—136; see ib. (1885), xliv. 19—21. Cardinal *Pitra* (Analecta sacra et classica, Paris, 1888, part I) published as writings of Basil certain Fragmenta in Psalmos (pp. 76—103), Ascetica (pp. 104—108), and Epitimia (pp. 108—110).

13. SEPARATE EDITIONS AND SPECIAL RESEARCHES. — S. Basilii Caesareae Cappad. archiep. et S. Gregorii Theol. vulgo Nazianz. archiepisc. Constantinop. opera dogmatica selecta (S. Bas. Adv. Eun. i—iii, and De Spir. Sancto). Edenda curavit *J. D. H. Goldhorn*, Leipzig, 1854 (Bibl. Patrum graec. dogmatica. Edendam curavit *J. C. Thilo*, vol. ii). The books Adv. Eun. iv—v are also found in *J. Dräseke*, Apollinarios von Laodicea, Leipzig, 1892, pp. 205—251, but these two books are, however, by no means the work of Apollinaris of Laodicæa, as Dräseke maintains (§ 61, 4) but very probably the work of Didymus the Blind, see *v. Funk*, Kirchengeschichtl. Abhandlungen und Untersuchungen (1899), ii. 291—329, and Theol. Quartalschr. (1901), lxxxiii. 113—116. A new edition of De Spiritu Sancto was brought out by *C. F H. Johnston*, Oxford, 1892. The same work is printed (Latin text) in *H. Hurter*, SS. Patr. opusc. selecta (series I), xxxi. *C. A. F Frémion* published (Paris, 1819) an excellent edition (with a French version) of the discourse or treatise, On the reading of pagan authors (reprinted in *Migne*, PG., xxxi. 563—590; cf. 1831—1844). Recent annotated editions of the same work were brought out by *E. Sommer*, Paris, 1894, and *J. Bach*, Münster, 1900; cf. *J. Clericus*, S. Basilii M. oratio ad iuvenes de libris profanis cum fructu legendis. Textum editionis monachorum O. S. B. ad ms. cod. Taurinensem recensuit, variis lectionibus instruxit, interpretationem italicam et notas adiecit, Turin, 1870. For the chronology of the letters of St. Basil see *V Ernst*, in Zeitschr. f. Kirchengesch. (1895—1896), xvi. 626—664, and *Fr. Loofs*, Eustathius von Sebaste und die Chronologie der Basiliusbriefe, Halle, 1898. *J. Dräseke* undertook, in Zeitschr. f. Kirchengesch. (1885—1886), viii. 85—123, the defence of the genuineness of the letters 361—364 (correspondence of St. Basil with Apollinaris of Laodicea). The pretended Ep. 16 Adv. Eunomium haereticum (*Migne*, PG., xxxii. 280—281) is not a letter, nor it is the work of Basil, but a chapter from the tenth book of Gregory of Nyssa, Contra Eunomium; cf. *Fr. Diekamp*, in Theol. Quartalschr. (1895), lxxvii. 277 to 285, also *E. Mercati*, Varia sacra (Testi e Studi), Rome, 1903, xi. 53 to 56; for a brief letter of Basil in reply to one of Gregory of Nazianzus ib. (pp. 57—70); letter 189 of Basil is adjudged to Gregory of Nyssa, and is re-edited (pp. 71—82) with the addition of hitherto unknown fragments. Recent editions of the so-called Liturgy of St. Basil are to be found in *H. A. Daniel*, Codex liturgicus ecclesiae orientalis (Cod. lit. eccl. univ. iv), Leipzig, 1853, pp. 421—438; *C. A. Swainson*, The Greek Liturgies chiefly from original authorities, Cambridge, 1884, pp. 75—87 149—171; and *F. E. Brightman*, Liturgies Eastern and Western; Oxford, 1896, i. Con-

cerning this liturgy the reader may consult *F. Probst,* Liturgie des 4. Jahrhunderts und deren Reform, Münster, 1893, pp. 377—412. *A. Vandepitte,* Saint Basile et l'origine de Complies, in Revue Augustinienne (1903), pp. 258—260. *Renz,* Die Geschichte des Messopferbegriffs, Freising, 1901, i. 340—376: Die drei grossen Kappadozier; 603—619: Die byzantinische Liturgie.

14. VERSIONS. — Rufinus of Aquileja tells us (Hist. eccl., ii. 9) that he translated into Latin about ten discourses of St. Basil and as many of St. Gregory of Nazianzus (denas ferme singulorum oratiunculas). The Benedictine edition of Basil's works contains (*Migne*, PG., xxxi. 1723—1794) eight homilies in the version of Rufinus; the seventh, however, is only the Ep. S. Basilii 46 ad virginem lapsam (ib., xxxii. 369—382). The two monastic rules of Basil (instituta monachorum, Hist. eccl., ii. 9), were also translated by Rufinus i. e. he made extracts from them which he embodied in one rule composed of 203 questions and answers. For the editions of this rule that the reader will not find in Migne (PG., xxix to xxxii, opp. S. Basilii), nor among the works of Rufinus (ib., PL., xxi.) see *v. Schoenemann,* Bibl. hist.-lit. Patrum lat. i. 619—622 (cf. *Migne,* PL., xxi. 35—37). The nine homilies on the Hexaemeron were translated into Latin (about 440) by a certain Eustathius Afer for the deaconness Syncletica (*Migne,* PG., xxx. 869—968). An ancient Latin version of the commentary on Isaias is found in Bibliotheca Casinensis (1880), iv. 390—424. An Armenian version of the homilies appeared at Venice in 1830. There is also an Armenian version of the thirteenth of the «twenty-four homilies» (see no. 7) known as Exhortatoria ad s. baptisma. *J. B. Aucher,* Severiani s. Seberiani Gabalorum episc. Emesensis homiliae, Venice, 1827. pp. 370—401. *J. G. Krabinger,* Basilius d. Gr. auserlesene Homilien. Aus dem Griechischen übersetzt und erläutert, Landshut, 1839 (fourteen homilies from the Benedictine text, corrected from other manuscripts). *V Gröne,* Ausgewählte Schriften des hl. Basilius d. Gr., Bischofs von Cäsarea und Kirchenlehrers, nach dem Urtext übersetzt, Kempten, 1875—1881, 3 vols. (Bibl. der Kirchenväter); the first volume contains the (9) homilies on the Hexaemeron and (21) selected discourses, the second the three treatises introductory to the Ascetica and the two Rules, and the third (97) selected letters. Selected discourses of St. Basil were also translated into German by *F. J. Winter,* in *G. Leonhardi*, Die Predigt der Kirche, Leipzig, 1892, xix. English translations of some of the works of St. Basil are found in A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church, series II, New York, 1895, viii.

15. WORKS ON SAINT BASIL. — *A. Rocchi* has made known two ancient Greek hymns in honor of St. Basil; see vol. x (Cozza-Luzi), of continuation of Mai's Nova Patrum Bibliotheca, Rome, 1905, part II, pp. 177—204. *C. R. W Klose,* Ein Beitrag zur Kirchengeschichte. Basilius d. Gr. nach seinem Leben und seiner Lehre, Stralsund, 1835. *J. Schermann,* Die Gottheit des Heiligen Geistes nach den griechischen Vätern des 4. Jahrhunderts, in Strassburger Theol. Studien, iv. 4—5. *J. Habert* (1647), Theologiae Graecorum Patrum vindicatae circa universam materiam gratiae libri tres, reprinted, Würzburg, 1863. *Fr. Böhringer,* Die Kirche Christi und ihre Zeugen, oder die Kirchengeschichte in Biographien, 2. ed., vii: Die drei Kappadozier, i. Basilius von Cäsarea, Stuttgart, 1875. *E. Fialon,* Etude historique et littéraire sur St. Basile, suivie de l'Hexaemeron, traduit en français, Paris, 1869. *P Allard,* S. Basile, Paris, 1899 (Les Saints). *Id.*, Dict. de la Théologie Catholique, Paris, 1905, ii. c. 441—455: Basile. *H. Weiss,* Die grossen Kappadozier Basilius, Gregor von Nazianz und Gregor von Nyssa als Exegeten. Ein Beitrag zur Ge-

schichte der Exegese, Brunsberg, 1872. *E. Scholl,* Die Lehre des hl. Basilius von der Gnade, Freiburg, 1881. *A. Kranich,* Der hl. Basilius in seiner Stellung zum «Filioque», Brunsberg, 1882. *Id.,* Die Aszetik in ihrer dogmatischen Grundlage bei Basilius d. Gr., Paderborn, 1896. *M. Berger,* Die Schöpfungslehre des hl. Basilius d. Gr. (2 Progr.), Rosenheim, 1897 to 1898. *Funk,* Kirchengeschichtl. Abhandlungen und Untersuchungen (1899), ii. 251—253: «Ein angebliches Wort Basilius' d. Gr über die Bilderverehrung» *K. Unterstein,* Die natürliche Gotteserkenntnis nach der Lehre der kappadozischen Kirchenväter Basilius, Gregor von Nazianz und Gregor von Nyssa (Progr.), Strassburg, 1903. *H. Weiss,* Die Erziehungslehre der drei Kappadozier. Ein Beitrag zur patristischen Pädagogik, in Strassburger Theol. Studien, Freiburg, 2903, v. 3—4. *Duchesne,* Histoire ancienne de l'Eglise, 2. ed., Paris, 1906, ii. c. xi: Basile de Césarée.

16. EUSTATHIUS OF SEBASTE. AMPHILOCHIUS OF ICONIUM. — Eustathius of Sebaste (see no. 3) circulated a pretended letter of St. Basil to Apollinaris of Laodicea, in which heretical doctrines were set forth. The letter was published by *B. Sebastiani,* Rome, 1796. Cf. *Fr. Loofs,* Eustathius von Sebaste, Halle, 1898. — St. Amphilochius (see no. 7), who was consecrated bishop of Iconium in 374 and metropolitan of Lycaonia († after 394), was a prominent ecclesiastical figure in the controversies of his time. He is quoted as an ecclesiastical writer by later writers and by councils, but the works current under his name (homiliae, epistola iambica ad Seleucum etc.) are probably all spurious, with the exception of an excellent synodal letter on the true divinity of the Holy Spirit, written in 377 in the name of a synod of his suffragans of Lycaonia, apparently to the bishops of Lycia. The works of Amphilochius, spurious and authentic, are found in *Gallandi,* Bibl. vet. Patr., vi. 457—514 (*Migne,* PG., xxxix. 13—130). The Epistola synodalis is also in *J. D. H. Goldhorn,* S. Basilii opp. dogm. sel., Leipzig, 1854, pp. 630—635; cf. *Fessler-Jungmann,* Institt. Patrol., i. 600 to 604. A hitherto unedited homily on the barren trees was published lately by *B. Z.,* Amphilochios von Ikonion. Rede über die unfruchtbaren Bäume, zum erstenmal herausgegeben, Jurjew in Livland, 1901. *K. Holl,* Amphilochius von Ikonium in seinem Verhältnis zu den grossen Kappadoziern, Tübingen, 1904.

### § 68. St. Gregory of Nazianzus, the Theologian.

1. GREGORY, BEFORE ORDINATION TO THE PRIESTHOOD. — Gregory of Nazianzus was born about 330, a little before Basil the Great, on the estate of Arianzum near Nazianzus, a city of south-western Cappadocia. He was like Basil educated in a spirit of Christian piety. The latter had been guided in the path of virtue by his holy grandmother Macrina; similarly, Gregory owed to his holy mother Nonna the first impulse to a religious life. He was sent as a youth to the most celebrated schools of his time, to Cæsarea in Cappadocia where he became acquainted with Basil, to Cæsarea in Palestine, also to Alexandria and Athens, where his former acquaintance with Basil grew into the intimate attachment that he still cherished with all the enthusiasm of boyhood when in 381 he was called on to deliver the funeral oration over the body of his friend[1]. About the year 360 he left Athens, was baptized at home, and lived partly

[1] Orat. 43, in laudem Basilii M.

at Arianzum and partly in monastic retirement with Basil in Pontus. This life seemed to him the supreme ideal, even while yet a student at Athens. At Arianzum, in the bosom of his family, he continued to cherish his early longings for a life dedicated in solitude to the service of God. In 360 or 361, he appeared publicly for the first time, and in the quality of peacemaker. His father Gregory was bishop of Nazianzus, and as such had signed the semiarian formula of Rimini (359) giving thereby grave scandal to the monks of Nazianzus who were firm adherents to the Nicene faith. Gregory caused his father to make in public an entirely orthodox profession of faith, and thereby appeased the monks (others place these events in 363 and 364).

2. GREGORY AS PRIEST AND BISHOP — It was probably in 361, at Christmas, that Gregory was ordained a priest, against his will, and by his father, in deference to the insistence of the people of Nazianzus. In his displeasure at the violence done him, he fled to his friend in Pontus, but soon returned, probably by Easter 362, and continued thenceforth to aid his father in the administration of the diocese. When Basil was engaged in his controversy with Anthimus, bishop of Tyana (§ 67, 3), he established several new sees in the smaller cities of Cappadocia, and placed his friend Gregory over one of them. This was Sasima, a poor and insignificant place in the territory to which Anthimus was laying claim as metropolitan. It was only after much resistance that Gregory was consecrated bishop by Basil at Nazianzus, but he soon withdrew into solitude; indeed, it is very doubtful whether he ever took possession of the see of Sasima. Yielding only the urgent requests of his father he returned to Nazianzus in 372, and took up the burden of diocesan administration again. His father died early in 374, and soon afterwards his mother breathed her last. About 369 his younger brother Cæsarius and his sister Gorgonia had passed away. In 375 Gregory who also had to endure great bodily sufferings laid down his charge as administrator of Nazianzus and entered upon a life of retirement and contemplation at Seleucia in Isauria. The sad news of the death of his friend Basil reached him here (379) and strengthened him in his resolution utterly to renounce all secular interests.

3. GREGORY AT CONSTANTINOPLE. — He was not, however, to enjoy the repose he so much desired. During the reign of Valens, the orthodox Catholics of Constantinople had dwindled to an almost imperceptible nucleus. When, however, Theodosius mounted the imperial throne (Jan. 19., 379), a happier future seemed to dawn for them, and they turned to Gregory with an urgent prayer to come to their aid and to reorganize the affairs of their church. He came (379) to the Capital of the East and commenced there a beneficent revival of religion. The various Arian parties put obstacles in his way and even

fomented discord in the ranks of the orthodox; more than once the life of Gregory was imperilled. His holy zeal knew no fear, and his marvellous eloquence won all hearts. His fame was so great that St. Jerome, though a man of mature age, was not ashamed to betake himself to Constantinople in order to listen to the preaching of Gregory and to profit by his special instruction in the interpretation of the Scriptures. The cathedral of the city had hitherto been held by the Arians, but when Theodosius made his triumphal entry (Dec. 24., 380) he caused it, probably the church of the Apostles, to be restored to the Catholics. The latter now insisted on having Gregory as their bishop, but he resisted with stubbornness until the meeting of the Second Ecumenical Council convoked by Theodosius and opened in May 381. The fathers declared him bishop of the city. It was with deep sorrow that he beheld the failure of his efforts to end the Meletian schism at Antioch, owing chiefly to the opposition of the younger members of the synod. When, therefore, the bishops of Egypt and Macedonia disputed the regularity of his nomination to the see of Constantinople, on the ground that it had been made before their arrival, he laid down the burden and dignity. In a splendid discourse delivered in the Cathedral before the episcopal assembly he bade them adieu and departed, probably in June 381. He retired to Nazianzus, and guided and protected the community of that city which had lost in his father its bishop, until, about 383, according to the desire of Gregory, it received in Eulalius a new pastor. Thenceforth he lived at Arianzum, devoted to his ascetical practices and his books. It was here, at his birthplace, that he died, probably in 389 or 390.

4. THE ORATIONS OF GREGORY — His writings fall naturally into three groups: Orations, Letters, and Poems. The 45 Orations are the most important[1]; among them those numbered 27—31 have always been considered the most perfect of his compositions. He designated them himself[2] as *οἱ τῆς θεολογίας λόγοι*, and it is to them that he owes the surname of «the theologian». They were delivered at Constantinople in defence of the ecclesiastical doctrine of the Trinity, and against the Macedonians and Eunomians. After treating in the first oration certain preliminary questions he proceeds in the second to treat of the existence, nature, and attributes of God, in so far as the human intellect can grasp them and human speech make them plain. In the third he demonstrates the unity of nature in the three Divine Persons, more particularly the divinity of the Son, while in the fourth he replies to the objections of the Arians against the divinity of the Son, by interpreting correctly the scriptural passages abused by them. The fifth oration is devoted to a refutation of the

[1] *Migne*, PG., xxxv. xxxvi. [2] Orat. 28, n. 1.

objections against the divinity of the Holy Spirit. In many ways similar are the orations no. 20 «on the order and establishment of bishops» and no. 32 «on moderation and purpose in controversies», both of which were delivered at Constantinople. The two invectives *(στηλιτευτικοί)* against the emperor Julian (no. 4 5) were composed after that emperor's death (June 26., 363) and probably were never delivered in public. In these discourses he intended to exhibit the person of the apostate, whom he had personally known at Athens, to the general contempt of his contemporaries and of posterity. Nevertheless, it is heat of passion that glows in them rather than true Christian enthusiasm. The oration no. 2 in which he explains and defends his flight after his ordination to the priesthood *(ἀπολογητικὸς τῆς εἰς τὸν Πόντον φυγῆς ἕνεκεν)* is too long to have ever been delivered in its present form. Possibly he may have preached in 362 the first or apologetic part of the discourse, and enlarged it, at a later date, until it became the treatise that we now possess on the excellence of the ecclesiastical state. It is the model and the source of the six books of Chrysostom's *περὶ ἱερωσύνης* (§ 74, 8). The other orations of Gregory are devoted to some ecclesiastical feast, some article of faith or duty of Christians, the commemoration of celebrated martyrs, of relatives and friends, or some important event of his own life. Among the commentators of his discourses the most famous is Elias of Crete, who probably lived in the tenth century.

5. GREGORY'S LETTERS AND POEMS. — At the request of his youthful relative, Nicobulus, our Saint made a collection of the greater part of his letters[1]. Most of the letters that have reached us — 243 in the Benedictine edition — date from the period of his final retirement at Arianzum (383—389), and appertain to personal occurrences in his life, or in those of his friends and relatives; only a few deal with theological questions. The 243[d] letter, often referred to in later times *(πρὸς Εὐάγριον μοναχὸν περὶ θεότητος)*[2] undertakes to present, with the aid of comparisons, an idea of the relation of the Son and the Holy Spirit to the Father, within the unity of the divine nature, that itself suffers no separation by reason of such distinctions. As works of literary art, the letters of Gregory are admirable. They are quite laconic and short, replete with «thoughts» and «points», frequently written with a painstaking industry that is evident, and often meant for an audience beyond the immediate recipient. — Most of his poems were composed within the same period as the letters. He sought to make headway, by means of poetical propaganda, against certain heresies, particularly that of Apollinaris, which did not hesitate to clothe their teachings in poetical garb in order to secure the adhesion of the people. Moreover, his poems were meant to supply

[1] Ep. 52 53; *Migne,* PG., xxxvii. 108—109.

[2] *Migne,* PG., xlvi. 1101—1108, inter opp. S. Greg. Nyss.; cf. xxxvii. 383.

in some measure the loss of the pagan writings that were only too often open sources of immorality for the Christian reader. In the poem entitled *In suos versus*[1], Gregory explains in detail the reasons which moved him in his old age to abandon the use of prose for metre. His poetry, however, is nothing more than versified prose, rather weak also and prolix. There is an occasional spark of poetic fire in his elegiac and satirical verses; otherwise, he is at his best in gnomic maxims and moral aphorisms, and in compact didactic instructions replete with Christian wisdom. The longest (1949 vv.) of his poems is entitled *De vita sua*[2]; it is also the principal historical source for the history of our Saint. The metrical form of his poems is very manifold, and in particular he exhibits a perfect mastery of trimeter, hexameter, pentameter, iambic and anacreontic verse. Occasionally he abandons the quantitative metre, as in the rhythmic *Hymnus vespertinus* and the *Exhortatio ad virgines*[3]. The tragedy *Christus patiens*[4] is a spurious work, written at a much later date, probably in the eleventh or twelfth century. Cosmas the Singer (§ 105, 6) composed *scholia* on the poems of Gregory. The Greek Anthology includes some epigrams of Gregory on Basil, Nonna, Cæsarius and others[5].

6. CHARACTER OF GREGORY — A certain irresoluteness appears in the whole life of Gregory; he yearns for solitude and quiet contemplation, and yet the prayers of his friends and his own sense of duty call him back to the active life, to a share in the movements and conflicts of his time. In this sphere he owes his success chiefly to his powerful eloquence. Though he is not a great ecclesiastical ruler like his friend Basil, he surpasses him in his command of the resources of persuasive rhetoric. He is beyond doubt one of the greatest orators of Christian antiquity, and that in spite of the tribute he had to pay to the taste of his own time which demanded a florid and grandiloquent style. In his didactic discourses he appears as an exponent and defender of the tradition of Christian faith. For him it is a matter of pride that he holds, unmodified and unadapted to the changing circumstances of his day, the faith that he has learned from the Scriptures and the holy fathers: *κατὰ πάντα καιρὸν ὁμοίως, οὐ συμμορφούμενος τοῖς καιροῖς*[6]; elsewhere he insists that he teaches (especially concerning the Trinity) after the manner of (Galilæan) fishermen, and not after the manner of Aristotle: *ἁλιευτικῶς, ἀλλ' οὐχ Ἀριστοτελικῶς*[7]. Gregory is not a profound thinker like his namesake of Nyssa; independent speculation was foreign to his genius. Yet it may be said of him that he is in a higher degree than his famous contemporary and associate, the representative of the common faith

[1] Poem. ii, 1, 39; *Migne*, PG., xxxvii. 1329—1336. [2] Ib., ii, 1, 11.
[3] Ib., i, 1, 32 and 2, 3. [4] *Migne*, PG., xxxviii. 133—338.
[5] Anthologia Palatina viii. [6] Or. 33, n. 15. [7] Or. 23, n. 12.

of the Greek Church toward the end of the fourth century. As early as the following century his dogmatic teaching was looked on with respect as a rule of Christian faith. *Manifestum namque indicium est non esse rectae fidei hominem qui in fide Gregorio non concordat*, says Rufinus of Aquileja in the preface to his Latin translation of some of Gregory's orations[1] Later theological writers among the Greeks, e. g. St. John Damascene, quoted with special satisfaction the works of «the Theologian».

7. HIS TRINITARIAN DOCTRINE. — Gregory's exposition of the ecclesiastical teaching concerning the Trinity deserves a careful study. His own mental tendency and a certain intimate relish, not less than the immediate needs of the faithful, led him to devote almost his whole life to the defence and illustration of that doctrine. He returns to the theme in nearly every discourse. The following passage[2] presents an accurate summary of his belief in the Trinity: «I give thee this profession of faith as a life-long guide and protector: One sole divinity and one power, which exists in three together and includes in itself the three distinct, not differing in substance or nature, neither increased by addition nor lessened by subtraction, in every respect equal, absolutely one, even as the single and undivided beauty and grandeur of the firmament, an infinite unity of three infinite persons, each being God as considered apart, God the Father and God the Son and God the Holy Ghost, each being distinct by His personal property *[proprietas]*; all three together being God: that on account of identity in nature *(ὁμοουσιότης)*, this on account of one sovereignty *(μοναρχία)*. When in my mind I consider one, I am illuminated round about by the three, and scarcely have I distinguished the three when I am again led back to their unity. When I look upon one of the three, I hold it to be the whole; my eye is overcome by the excess of light whose fulness escapes my powers. I am unable so to grasp the grandeur of this one, as to accord the plentitude (of vision) to that which remains; when, however, I comprehend all three in my contemplation, I see but one ray, and am unable to distinguish or to measure the united light.» — With regard to the divinity of the Holy Spirit, while he defended the reserve and the prudence of Basil in setting forth this truth (§ 67, 9), he was himself less cautious. About 372 he asks himself publicly[3]: «How long must we keep our light under the bushel and defraud others of the perfect divinity (of the Holy Spirit)? The light should rather be placed on the candlestick that it may shine through all the churches, and in every mind, and over the whole earth, no longer as in an image and in shadowy outline presented to the intellect, but clearly set forth.»[4] In his panegyric on his friend Basil[5] he relates how amid the cruel pressure of the times *(τοῦ καιροῦ*

[1] *Migne*, PG., xxxvi. 736. [2] Or. 40, n. 41. [3] Or. 12, n. 6.
[4] Cf. Ep. 58. [5] Or. 43, n. 69.

*στενοχωροῦντος ἡμᾶς)* Basil had adopted for himself, in view of his exposed position, a prudent reserve *(τὴν οἰκονομίαν)*, while to the much less imperilled Gregory he left full freedom of speech *(τὴν παῤῥησίαν)*. — The *filioque* is not found in the writings of Gregory as clearly and openly as in those of Basil. He takes it, however, for recognized and granted, that the Son also is principle or origin of the Holy Spirit. When he says[1] in his discourse before the Second Ecumenical Council (381) that the Father is *ἄναρχος*, the Son *ἀρχὴ* and the Holy Spirit *τὸ μετὰ τῆς ἀρχῆς*, he implicitly affirms between Holy Spirit and Son the mutual relation of the Proceeding and of the Principle from Whom He proceeds. Moreover, he expressly says that the Holy Spirit is *τὸ ἐξ ἀμφοῖν συνημμένον*[2] or «composed of both», i. e. he proceeds equally from the Father and the Son[3]. The poem entitled *Praecepta ad virgines* ends with these words: One God, from the Begetter through the Son, to the great Spirit *(εἷς θεὸς ἐκ γενέταο δι' υἱέος ἐς μέγα πνεῦμα* — the so-called *κίνησις τῆς μονάδος εἰς τριάδα)*, since the perfect divinity subsists in perfect persons.»

8. COMPLETE EDITIONS. — The most valuable of the early editions is that of *J. Billius* and *F. Morellus*, Paris, 1609—1611, 2 vols., reprinted at Paris in 1630 and at Cologne (Leipzig) in 1690. The best edition is that of the Benedictines. Its history is rather unique. The first volume containing all the orations was delayed by the death of several co-workers, and was published by *Ph. Clemencet*, Paris, 1778. The second volume was delayed by the French Revolution and appeared as late as 1840, post operam et studium monachorum O. S. B. edente et accurante *D. A. B. Caillau*. It contains the complete collection of the poems and letters of Gregory. In the edition of *Billius* and *Morellus* the numbering of the orations, poems, and letters differs from that adopted by the Benedictines; a comparative list of the contents of both editions is found in *Fessler*, Instit. Patrol. (1850—1851), i. 747—762. The Benedictine edition is reprinted, with many additions, in *Migne*, PG., xxxv—xxxviii, Paris, 1857—1858.

9. NEW EDITIONS. SEPARATE EDITIONS. — S. Basilii Caesareae Cappad. archiep. et S. Gregorii Theol. vulgo Nazianz. archiepisc. Constantinop. opera dogmatica selecta (S. Greg. Orat. de dogmate et constitutione episcoporum, Orat. theologicae, Epist. ad Cledonium, Epist. ad Nectarium). Edenda curavit *J. D. H. Goldhorn*, Leipzig, 1854 (Bibl. Patrum graec. dogmatica. Edendam curavit *J. C. Thilo*. ii). A new edition of the Orationes quinque de theologia was brought out by *A. J. Mason*, Cambridge, 1899; cf. *Miser*, Les manuscrits Parisiens de Grégoire de Nazianze, in Revue de Philologie (1902), xxvi. 44—62, and (1903), xxvii. 125—138 378—391. *E. Bouvy*, Les manuscrits des discours de St. Grég. de Naz., in Revue Augustinienne (1902), pp. 222—237. A separate edition of the Orat. apologetica de fuga sua was issued by *J. Alzog*, Freiburg, 1858 1868; one of the Orat. in fratrem Caesarium by *E. Sommer*, Paris, 1875 1885 1898; one of the Orat. in laudem Machabaeorum by *E. Sommer*, Paris, 1891 1900. A diligently edited text of some epic and didactic poems

[1] Or. 42, n. 15. [2] Or. 31, n. 2.

[3] *D. Lenain* maintains, in the Revue d'histoire et de littérature religieuse (1901), vi. 533, that by these words Gregory means no more than that the formula Holy Spirit is composed of two words «Holy» and «Spirit».

of Gregory is found in *W Christ* and *M. Paranikas*, Anthologia graeca carminum christianorum, Leipzig, 1871, pp. 23—32; cf. Prolog. xii—xv. The two metrical pieces Exhortatio ad virgines and Hymnus vespertinus were last edited by *W. Meyer*, Anfang und Ursprung der lateinischen und griechischen rhythmischen Dichtung, in Abhandlungen der k. bayer. Akad. d. Wissensch., I. Kl., xvii. 2, 400—409, 1885; cf. pp. 313—315; cf. *Fr. Hanssen*, in Philologus (1885), xliv. 228—235, and *Edm. Bouvy*, Poètes et Mélodes, Nîmes, 1886, pp. 133—138. The poems of Gregory generally have been the subject of numerous works: *M. Schubach*, De b. patris Gregorii Nazianzeni Theologi carminibus commentatio patrologica, Coblenz, 1871; *P. Stoppel*, Quaestiones de Gregorii Nazianzeni poetarum scaenicorum imitatione et arte metrica (Diss. inaug.), Rostock, 1881. Cf. *A. Ludwich*, in Rhein. Museum f. Philol., new series (1887), xlii. 233—238; *G. Knaack*, in Neue Jahrb. f. Philol. und Pädag. (1887), cxxxv. 619—620. *E. Dubedout*, De Gregorii Nazianzeni carminibus (Thèse), Paris, 1901. *W Ackermann*, Die didaktische Poesie des Gregorius von Nazianz (Dissert.), Leipzig, 1903. — Christus patiens. Tragoedia christiana quae inscribi solet Χριστὸς πάσχων Gregorio Nazianzeno falso attributa. Rec. *J. G. Brambs*, Leipzig, 1885. *Id.*, De auctoritate tragoediae christianae quae inscribi solet Χριστὸς πάσχων Gregorio Nazianzeno falso attributa, Eichstätt, 1883. A German version of that tragedy which preserves the original metre was made by *E. A. Pullig*, Bonn, 1893 (Progr.). For a more detailed discussion of this drama, the only survival of its kind in the Byzantine period, cf. *Krumbacher*, Geschichte der byzantinischen Literatur, 2. ed., München, 1897, pp. 746 ff.

10. ANCIENT COMMENTARIES ON THE ORATIONS AND POEMS OF GREGORY. — The following mediæval commentaries on the orations of Gregory are found in *Migne*, PG., xxxvi: Eliae metropolitae Cretae commentarii in S. Gregorii Naz. orationes 19. E codice ms. Basileensi excerpsit *A. Iahnius*. Accedunt Basilii aliorumque scholia in S. Gregorii orationes e codicibus Monacensibus excerpta (ib., 737—932); Nicetae Serronii commentarius in orat. 1 et 11. Accedunt duorum anonymorum scholia. Ex edit. *Chr. Fr. Matthaei* (ib., 933—984); Nonni abbatis commentarii in orationes II contra Iulianum imp. ex edit. *Montacutii*, in laudem funebrem S. Basilii et in orationem in sancta lumina ex edit. *Maii* (ib., 985—1072); Basilii Minimi scholia in orationem duplicem contra Iulianum imp., et de Herone philosopho, edente *Boissonadio*, et ad orationem funebrem in Caesarium fratrem, edente *L. de Sinner* (ib., 1073—1206); Anonymi scholia in easdem orationes contra Iulianum imp., ex edit. *Montacutii* (ib., 1205—1256, xxx). A supplement to these commentaries is printed in *Migne*, PG., cxxvii. 1177—1480: Nicetae Serronii Heracleensis metropolitae Expositio in oratt. 38 39 40 45 44 41, but only in the Latin version of Billius. For the commentaries of «Abbot Nonnus» cf. *E. Patzig*, De Nonnianis in IV orationes Gregorii Naz. commentariis, Leipzig, 1890 (Progr.). Patzig is of opinion that the author of these commentaries lived in Syria or Palestine, in the early part of the sixth century; the name of Nonnus is not vouched for by any contemporary evidence. *A. Maraudiau (Nonnos)*, Die Scholien zu fünf Reden des Gregor von Nazianz, Marburg, 1903, Armenian scholia attributed to the philosopher and translator David. See § 107, 3 for commentaries of Maximus Confessor on various orations. Other scholia were published by *E. Piccolomini*, Estratti inediti dai codici greci della Biblioteca Mediceo-Laurenziana, Pisa, 1879, pp. 1—45; cf. Pref. iii—xlii, and by *E. Norden*, Scholia in Gregorii Naz. orationes inedita, in Hermes (1892), xxvii. 606—642; *Id.*, in Zeitschr. für wissensch. Theol. (1893), ii. 441—447. — *Migne*, PG., xxxviii, contains the following

commentaries on the poems of Gregory: Cosmae Hierosolymitani commentarii (see § 105, 6); Nicetae Davidis Paraphrasis carminum arcanorum, cura *E. Dronke* e codice Cusano edita (ib., 681—842); Anonymi Paraphrasis carminis de libris canonicis (ib., 843—846); the Prooemium to the Paraphrasis of Nicetas David is found in *Migne,* PG., cv., 577—582.

11. VERSIONS. — Rufinus of Aquileja translated into Latin ten of the orations of Gregory (§ 67, 14) and Basil. Eight orations in the translation of Rufinus were published at Strassburg in 1508; cf. *Fessler,* Instit. Patrol. (1850—1851), i. 570, and *Schoenemann,* Bibl. hist.-lit. Patrum lat., i. 627—628 (*Migne,* PL., xxi. 39—49). The version of Rufinus was not reprinted in *Migne,* with the exception of the preface (PG., xxxvi. 735 to 736). The Syriac version of the letter Ad Evagrium monachum de divinitate (see no. 5) has already been mentioned (§ 47, 5). It was edited by *de Lagarde* and *Martin* and translated into German by Ryssel. The Carmina iambica of Gregory were published in Syriac by *J. Bollig* and *H. Gismondi,* Beirût, 1895—1896, 2 vols. There is a Syriac version of the Orat. in laudem Machabaeorum, in *Bensly-Barnes,* The Fourth Book of Maccabees, Cambridge, 1895, pp. 55—74. Selections from Gregory were translated into German by *J. Röhm* (25 orations), Kempten, 1874—1877, 2 vols. (Bibliothek der Kirchenväter), and by *F. J. Winter* (who follows closely in the footsteps of Röhm), «Ausgewählte Reden», Leipzig, 1890 (*G. Leonhardi,* Die Predigt der Kirche, x); *G. Wohlenberg* translated the Apology (see no. 4), Gotha, 1890 (Bibl. theolog. Klassiker, xxix). An English version of selected orations and letters by *Ch. W Browne* and *J. E. Swallow* appears in A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church, ser. 2, New York, 1894, vii.

12. WORKS ON GREGORY. — *C. Ullmann* Gregorius von Nazianz, der Theologe, Darmstadt, 1825, 2. ed., Gotha, 1867. *Fr. Böhringer,* Die Kirche Christi und ihre Zeugen, oder die Kirchengeschichte in Biographien, viii: 1. Die drei Kappadozier. 2. Gregor von Nyssa. 3. Gregor von Nazianz. Stuttgart, 1876. *A. Benoît,* St. Grégoire de Nazianze, archevêque de Constantinople et docteur de l'Eglise, Paris, 1876, 2. ed. revue, 1885, 2 vols. *C. Cavallier,* St. Grégoire de Nazianze . par l'abbé *A. Benoît,* étude bibliographique, Montpellier, 1886. *J. Hergenröther,* Die Lehre von der göttlichen Dreieinigkeit nach dem hl. Gregor von Nazianz, dem Theologen, Ratisbon, 1850. *Schwane,* Dogmengeschichte, Freiburg, 1895, ii, § 18: Die Trinitätslehre des hl. Gregor von Nazianz. *H. Weiss,* Die grossen Kappadozier Basilius, Gregor von Nazianz und Gregor von Nyssa als Exegeten, Brunsberg, 1872. *J. Dräseke,* Quaestionum Nazianzenarum specimen (Progr.), Wandsbeck, 1876. *Id.,* Gregorius von Nazianz und sein Verhältnis zum Apollinarismus, in Theol. Studien und Kritiken (1892), lxv. 473—512. *Fr. K. Hümmer,* Des hl. Gregor von Nazianz, des Theologen, Lehre von der Gnade, Kempten, 1890. *J. R. Asmus,* Gregorius von Nazianz und sein Verhältnis zum Kynismus, in Theol. Studien und Kritiken (1894), lxvii. 314—339. *K. Unterstein,* Die natürliche Gotteserkenntnis nach der Lehre der kappadozischen Kirchenväter Basilius, Gregor von Nazianz und Gregor von Nyssa (Progr.), Strassburg, 1902—1903. *K. Weiss,* Die Erziehungslehre der drei Kappadozier. Ein Beitrag zur patristischen Pädagogik, in Strassburger Theol. Studien, Freiburg, 1903. *Duchesne,* Hist. ancienne de l'Eglise, 2. ed., Paris, ii, c. xii. Grégoire de Nazianze.

13. CÆSARIUS OF NAZIANZUS. — Cæsarius, a younger brother of Gregory (see no. 2), held a high and honorable office as physician in the imperial court under Constantius and Julian, and was also honored by Jovian and Valens. He died just as he was about to retire to private life, in

368 or the early part of 369, after a brief illness. The collection of (197) miscellaneous questions and answers, chiefly theological, divided into four dialogues and current under the name of Cæsarius (Dialogi IV s. Quaestiones et responsiones: *Gallandi,* Bibl. vet. Patr., vi. 1—152, and thence reprinted in *Migne*, PG., xxxviii. 851—1190), is declared spurious by nearly all critics.

### § 69. St. Gregory of Nyssa.

1. HIS LIFE. — Gregory of Nyssa was a brother of Basil the Great, younger, it is thought, by several years, though the exact date of his birth is not known. His whole youth, indeed, is shrouded in obscurity. Basil apparently took charge of his education; at least Gregory often speaks of him to their younger brother Peter in terms of respect and gratitude; he calls him the beloved father and teacher of both: *πατὴρ καὶ διδάσκαλος* s. *καθηγητής*[1]. He was already an «anagnostes» or reader in the Church when he was seduced by the charms of a worldly career, and embraced the calling of a teacher of rhetoric; Gregory of Nazianzus says[2] that he would then rather be called a rhetorician than a Christian. It is very probable, though many deny it, that he was married. Eventually he yielded to the prayers of his friends, principally of Gregory of Nazianzus, and entered the ecclesiastical state. He gave up his office as teacher, withdrew for some time into solitude, and in the autumn of 371, much against his will, was consecrated bishop of Nyssa, an insignificant town under the jurisdiction of St. Basil. He met with violent opposition from the Arians of this place; in 375 he was deposed from his see by a synod of Arian bishops convened by Demosthenes, governor of Pontus. For several years he led a wandering life, being likened by Gregory of Nazianzus[3] to a bit of drift-wood tossed hither and thither by the waves. The death of Valens, at the end of 378, brought about a change in the politico-ecclesiastical situation. The return of Gregory to his people assumed the character of a triumphal procession. In the autumn of 379 he took part in a synod at Antioch specially convoked for the purpose of healing the Meletian schism. In 381 he attended the Second Ecumenical Council at Constantinople, and took a prominent part in the proceedings as one of its principal theologians. In execution of the second canon of the Council the emperor Theodosius issued a decree (July 30., 381)[4] that all those should be expelled as heretics from the churches of Pontus who did not communicate with Helladius, bishop of Cæsarea (in Cappadocia) and successor of Basil, Otrejus of Melitene in Armenia, and Gregory of Nyssa. Gregory visited the capital on other occasions; the last time he appeared there was in 394, when he assisted at a synod held by the patriarch Nestorius for the purpose of reconciling some Arabian bishops. After this his

[1] De hominis opificio, prol.; In Hexaemeron, prol. et epil.; Ep. ad Petrum.
[2] Ep. 11. [3] Ep. 81. [4] c. 3, C. Th. xvi, 1, De fide cath.

name disappears from history; it is believed that his death took place about this time. We learn from one of his letters[1] that his declining years were troubled by paltry annoyances on the part of Helladius of Cæsarea.

2. EXEGETICAL WORKS. — Gregory of Nyssa is one of the most diligent and versatile ecclesiastical writers of his day. The greater part of his works deal with scriptural exegesis although it was not here that his genius shone most brightly. He was a great admirer of the erudition and acumen of Origen; hence, in most of his own exegetical writings he betrays the influence of the hermeneutical principles of the Alexandrine doctor. He delights in seeking and finding beneath every word of the biblical text a fund of moral instruction. The result is that under this treatment the literal sense runs great danger of evaporating, or of being sacrificed completely, e. g. at the beginning of his homily on the Canticle of canticles. He is most sane and temperate in his interpretation of the Creation-narrative concerning the endowment of man *(περὶ κατασκευῆς ἀνθρώπου)*[2] and on the work of the six days *(Ἀπολογητικὸς περὶ τῆς ἑξαημέρου)*[3]. Both of these works were written in 379 at the request of his brother Peter, the bishop of Sebaste. The former, also the first written, was meant to complete the homilies of Basil on the work of the six days (§ 67, 5); the second was written in order to remove some misunderstandings of both the Scripture text and Basil's exposition of it. Throughout this work Gregory follows in the footsteps of Basil in his homilies and pays special attention to the literal sense, towards the end he asserts, not without a certain satisfaction, that he has never distorted the literal sense of Scripture into figurative allegory, *εἰς τροπικὴν ἀλληγορίαν*. Yet in later years, when he exhibits before a certain Cæsarius the figure of Moses as a model and criterion for one's own life *(περὶ τοῦ βίου Μωϋσέως τοῦ νομοθέτου ἢ περὶ τῆς κατ' ἀρετὴν τελειότητος)*[4] he indulges in the boldest and most fine-spun allegorizing. In the two tractates usually entitled: *εἰς τὴν ἐπιγραφὴν τῶν ψαλμῶν*[5], he yields still more, were it possible, to his penchant for allegory. On the hypothesis that all Psalms contain precepts for a virtuous life, he seeks to demonstrate, in the nine chapters of the first tractate, that the Psalms as found in our collection are distributed according to a consistent plan, and that the division of the collection into five books represents five steps or levels of an educational ladder by which we gradually reach the summit of perfection. In the sixteen chapters of the second tractate he discusses mostly the Septuagint titles of the Psalms; according to him they exist for the sole purpose of leading to something good (*τὸ πρός τι τῶν ἀγαθῶν καθηγήσασθαι*, c. 2). In the editions of his works there is added a homily on the sixth

[1] *Greg. Nyss.*, Ep. 1. [2] *Migne*, PG., xliv. 125—256.
[3] Ib., xliv. 61—124. [4] Ib., xliv. 297—430. [5] Ib., xliv. 432—608.

Psalm[1]. The eight homilies on Eccl. i. 1 to iii. 13[2], aim at proving that this «truly sublime and divinely inspired» book has for its purpose «the uplifting of the spirit above the senses. The former will then lead the latter into a region of peace, through its renunciation of all that is apparently great and splendid in the things of this world» *(τὸ ὑπερθεῖναι τὸν νοῦν τῆς αἰσθήσεως καὶ παῦσαι καταλιπόντα πᾶν ὅτιπέρ ἐστιν μέγα τε καὶ λαμπρὸν ἐν τοῖς οὖσιν φαινόμενον)*[3]. The fifteen homilies on the Canticle of canticles (i. 1 to vi. 8) develop in a bold and free manner the idea that under the preparations for a human wedding the writer depicts the union of the human soul with God *(τὸ μὲν ὑπογραφόμενον ἐπιθαλάμιός τίς ἐστιν παρασκευή, τὸ δ' ἐννοούμενον τῆς ἀνθρωπίνης ψυχῆς ἡ πρὸς τὸ θεῖόν ἐστιν ἀνάκρασις)*[4]. In his brief tractate on the Witch of Endor *(περὶ τῆς ἐγγαστριμύθου)*[5], he says that the woman (1 Kings xviii. 12 ff.) did not see Samuel but a demon who put on the figure of the prophet. Among Gregory's interpretations of the New Testament are five homilies on the Lord's Prayer *(εἰς τὴν προσευχήν)*[6], and eight homilies on the beatitudes *(εἰς τοὺς μακαρισμούς)*[7], practical and exhortatory commentaries that have always been highly esteemed. The authenticity of the exposition of 1 Cor. xv. 28[8] is disputed by some.

3. DOGMATICO-SPECULATIVE WRITINGS. — The dogmatico-speculative writings of Gregory of Nyssa surpass in value his exegetical writings. The most important of them is his large «catechesis» *(λόγος κατηχητικὸς ὁ μέγας)*[9], an argumentative defence of the principal Christian doctrines against heathens, Jews, and heretics. It is, according to the Prologue, formally dedicated to Christian teachers, and its purpose is to instruct them in detail how best to seize the opponent's point of view, and to proceed from his own admissions. Hence, the course of the argument varies between biblio-theological and philosophico-speculative considerations. Foremost among the Christian doctrines are the Trinity, the Redemption of mankind by the Incarnate Logos, and the application of the grace of Redemption through baptism and the Eucharist. The most extensive of his extant works, likewise one of the most important refutations of Arianism, is that against Eunomius in twelve (or thirteen) books, *πρὸς Εὐνόμιον ἀντιῤῥητικοὶ λόγοι*[10]. It was undertaken at the request of his brother Peter, of whom only this letter to his brother Gregory has been preserved[11], as a reply to the *ὑπὲρ τῆς ἀπολογίας ἀπολογία* with which Eunomius had answered the writing of St. Basil against himself (§ 67, 4), probably a short time before the death of St. Basil, with the double purpose of defending the latter against the accusations

[1] Ib., xliv. 608—616. [2] Ib., xliv. 616—753. [3] Hom. 1 to i. 1.
[4] Hom. 1. [5] *Migne,* PG., xlv. 108—113. [6] Ib., xliv. 1120—1193.
[7] Mt. v. 1—10: Ib., xliv. 1193—1301. [8] Ib., xliv. 1304—1325.
[9] Ib., xlv. 9—105. [10] Ib., xlv. 237—1121. [11] Ib., xlv. 241—244.

of Eunomius in his reply to Basil, and of fully expounding the teaching of Basil concerning the divinity of the Son and the Holy Ghost. The internal disposition of the books into which it is divided, and their order of succession, are not yet sufficiently clear; in the text of all editions up to the present the connection and progress of the writer's thought appear interrupted and uncertain. Gregory wrote also two works against Apollinaris of Laodicea. The first *ἀντιῤῥητικὸς πρὸς τὰ Ἀπολλιναρίου*[1], is an answer (written probably before 383) to the work of Apollinaris entitled «Demonstration of the Incarnation of God in the image of man» (§ 61, 4). It is devoted to the refutation of the heresy of Apollinaris, viz. that the body of Christ came down from heaven, and that in it the divine Logos took the place of the human soul *(νοῦς)*. An appendix to this work is the small tractate *κατ' Ἀπολλιναρίου*[2] dedicated to Theophilus, patriarch of Alexandria. Other works of Gregory are devoted to the defence and illustration of the Trinitarian teaching of the Church. Among them are a treatise entitled: How we must not believe that there are three gods *(περὶ τοῦ μὴ οἴεσθαι λέγειν τρεῖς θεούς)*[3] addressed to a certain Ablabius; a similar work entitled: Against the heathens on a basis of common sense *(πρὸς Ἕλληνας ἐκ τῶν κοινῶν ἐννοιῶν)*[4]; On faith, to the tribune Simplicius *(περὶ πίστεως)*[5] in defence of the divinity of the Son and the Holy Spirit; On the Trinity and that the Holy Spirit is God, printed among the works of St. Basil *(περὶ τῆς ἁγίας τριάδος καὶ ὅτι θεὸς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον)*[6]. It is addressed to Eustathius of Sebaste, and is by some ascribed to Basil. Mai discovered two orations of Gregory of Nyssa against Arius and Sabellius[7] and another (incomplete) against the Macedonians[8]. — An especial interest attaches to the Dialogue of Gregory with his sister Macrina on the soul and the resurrection *(περὶ ψυχῆς καὶ ἀναστάσεως)*[9]. He was still grieving over the loss of his brother Basil when, on his homeward journey from a synod at Antioch, he visited (379) his sister Macrina, to whom he was no less devoted than to his brother. She was then resident on an estate of the family situated on the river Iris in Pontus, as the superior of a pious sisterhood with whom she led a life of entire consecration to the divine service. Gregory found her in immediate danger of death; their conversation naturally turned on their future reunion in heaven. This dialogue, composed shortly after the death of Macrina, puts into her mouth the views of Gregory on the soul, death, resurrection and the final restoration of all things. Macrina appears as a teacher, hence the work is entitled *τὰ Μακρίνια*. In the treatise against Fate, *κατὰ*

[1] *Migne*, PG., xlv. 1124—1269. [2] Ib., xlv. 1269—1277.
[3] Ib., xlv. 116—136. [4] Ib., xlv. 176—185. [5] Ib., xlv. 136—145.
[6] Ib., xxxii. 684—696, inter opp. S. Bas. M. [7] Ib., xlv. 1281—1301.
[8] Ib., xlv. 1301—1333. [9] Ib., xlvi. 12—160.

*εἱμαρμένης*[1], he defends the freedom of the will against astrological fatalism. The treatise on children who die prematurely *(περὶ τῶν νηπίων πρὸ ὥρας ἀφαρπαζομένων)*[2] undertakes to explain to Hierius, prefect of Cappadocia, why God permits such untimely deaths. The work «Selected arguments against the Jews», *ἐκλογαὶ μαρτυριῶν πρὸς Ἰουδαίους*[3], is probably spurious and certainly interpolated.

4. ASCETICAL WORKS. — More or less ascetic in tendency are the little works: On the meaning of the Christian name or profession *(περὶ τοῦ τί τὸ χριστιανῶν ὄνομα ἢ ἐπάγγελμα)*[4], written to a certain Harmonius; On perfection and what manner of man the Christian should be *(περὶ τελειότητος καὶ ὁποῖον χρὴ εἶναι τὸν χριστιανόν)*[5], to the monk Olympius; On the end (of creation) according to the divine will *(περὶ τοῦ κατὰ θεὸν σκόπου)*[6], written especially for monks. The admirable book; On virginity *(περὶ παρθενίας)*[7] or the state of perfection was written during his retirement, about 370. Its purpose, as stated in the preface, is to strengthen in all who read it the desire for a virtuous life, *τῆς κατ' ἀρετὴν ζωῆς*. Elsewhere the practico-moral view-point often asserts itself in his discourses and letters.

5. DISCOURSES AND LETTERS. — The former are not numerous, but they exhibit the contemporary fondness for superfluous ornament and magniloquence, to which even Gregory of Nazianzus fell a victim (§ 68, 6), although the latter is far superior as an orator both to St. Basil and St. Gregory of Nyssa. Among the moral writings of our Gregory may be mentioned the discourses: Against those who put off their baptism, *πρὸς τοὺς βραδύνοντας εἰς τὸ βάπτισμα*; Against the usurers, *κατὰ τῶν τοκιζόντων*; Against those who mourn excessively for their dead, *πρὸς τοὺς πενθοῦντας ἐπὶ τοῖς ἀπὸ τοῦ παρόντος βίου πρὸς τὸν ἀΐδιον μεθισταμένοις*. The discourse on the divinity of the Son and the Holy Spirit and on the faith of Abraham, *περὶ θεότητος υἱοῦ καὶ πνεύματος λόγος καὶ ἐγκώμιον εἰς τὸν δίκαιον Ἀβραάμ*, delivered probably in 383 at Constantinople, is often mentioned with esteem in later Greek literature. It is the same subject that recurs in the discourse usually entitled «On his own delegation», *εἰς τὴν ἑαυτοῦ χειροτονίαν*, delivered probably at Constantinople in 381, when he was charged, in company with Helladius and Otrejus, with the ecclesiastical supervision of the province of Pontus. He wrote also a few other discourses for feasts of the Church, panegyrics on the protomartyr Stephen (two), on the martyr Theodore, on the forty martyrs of Sebaste (two), on St. Ephræm Syrus and on St. Basil. We possess also from his pen three funeral sermons, on Meletius of Antioch, the princess Pulcheria, and the empress Flaccilla; the first was probably delivered in 381 during the Council; the other two

[1] Ib., xlv. 145—173. [2] Ib., xlvi. 161—192. [3] Ib., xlvi. 193—233.
[4] Ib., xlvi. 237—249. [5] Ib., xlvi. 252—285. [6] Ib., xlvi. 288—305.
[7] Ib., xlvi. 317—416.

in close succession, during 385 and at Constantinople. Gregory has given in the form of an encomium also his biography of St. Gregory Thaumaturgus (§ 47, 1) and that of his sister Macrina. — There are twenty-six of his letters in Migne[1]. Special mention may be made of two letters that led to lively controversies between Catholics and Protestants in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. They are no. 3 to the sisters Eustathia and Ambrosia, and no. 2 on those who go as pilgrims to Jerusalem, *περὶ τῶν ἀπιόντων εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα.* At the request of the Synod of Antioch (379), but according to others at that of the Second Eucumenical Council (381), Gregory made a journey to Arabia in order to restore ecclesiastical peace in that country, on which occasion he also visited the holy places of Palestine. In the first of the letters referred to, he relates the vivid impressions made on him by the sight of the holy places and speaks with sorrow of the unhappy ecclesiastical conditions of Palestine; in the second he condemns severely the abuses that were springing up apropos of pilgrimages and utters a warning against exaggerated notions of their religious value; in his zeal against abuses he may have failed to appreciate justly the intrinsic value of this pious practice.

6. GREGORY'S PLACE IN THEOLOGY. — The ecclesiastical importance of Gregory consists in his power of philosophical defence and demonstration of the Christian faith. He was a man of erudition, both as a philosopher and a theologian, but less adapted to and competent for the office and works of a pastor of souls and an ecclesiastical administrator. At least St. Basil complains frequently of the excessive amiability and simplicity *(χρηστότης, ἁπλότης)* of his brother[2] On a later occasion[3] he declared him thoroughly inexperienced in ecclesiastical affairs, *παντελῶς ἄπειρον τῶν κατὰ τὰς ἐκκλησίας*, and quite unsuited to deal with a person so conscious of his office and position as Pope Damasus. However, all the more praise was bestowed on the scientific accomplishments of Gregory, which he put to the best use in his speculation on the doctrines of the Trinity and of the resurrection of the body.

7. THE TRINITY IN GREGORY'S WRITINGS. — It is clear from the preceding account of Gregory's writings (no. 3; cf. no. 5) that he was an indefatigable defender of the divine nature. He is not so happy in his attempts to reconcile the Trinity and the Unity. He seems to anticipate, in a measure, the extreme realism of the Middle Ages, and to admit, even in finite things, the numerical unity of essence or nature. «We begin by stating», says he in the opening paragraph of the treatise *De eo quod non putandum sit tres Deos dici oportere*[4], «that it is a prevalent abuse to bestow the name of nature in the plural on those things which do not differ in nature, to speak for example of many

[1] *Migne,* PG., xlvi. [2] Ep. 58 60 100. [3] Ep. 215.
[4] *Migne,* PG., xlv. 117 120.

men. It is the same as if we spoke of many human natures. There are many indeed who share the same nature. But in all of them man is one *(ὥστε πολλοὺς μὲν εἶναι τοὺς μετεσχηκότας τῆς φύσεως ἕνα δὲ ἐν πᾶσιν τὸν ἄνθρωπον)*, because, as we have said, the term man indicates not the individual but the common nature. It would be far better to correct this faulty expression of ours and cease to cover a plurality with the name of nature; we should then be no longer tempted to project our error of speech into theological doctrine.» This confusion of the abstract idea that excludes plurality with the concrete idea that exacts a plurality, comes out even more plainly in the treatise *Adv. Graecos ex communibus notionibus*[1]: *ἔστιν δὲ καὶ Πέτρος καὶ Παῦλος καὶ Βαρνάβας κατὰ τὸ ἄνθρωπος εἷς ἄνθρωπος καὶ κατὰ τὸ αὐτὸ τοῦτο, κατὰ τὸ ἄνθρωπος, πολλοὶ οὐ δύνανται εἶναι, λέγονται δὲ πολλοὶ ἄνθρωποι καταχρηστικῶς καὶ οὐ κυρίως.* It is all the more necessary, he goes on to say, to hold fast to the unity of God or the divinity, because the word *θεός* expresses an activity rather than a nature (it comes from *θεᾶσθαι*, and means to look down upon all things), and this activity can only be one, although the divine persons have it in common. What is true of the Trinity differs essentially from what holds good in the case of the activity of three philosophers or rhetoricians. «Every activity that proceeds from God, which relates to creatures, and is designated according to the variety thereof, takes its origin from the Father, proceeds through the Son, and is perfected in the Holy Spirit, *ἐκ πατρὸς ἀφορμᾶται καὶ διὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ πρόεισιν καὶ ἐν τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἁγίῳ τελειοῦται.* Hence we cannot speak of several activities, though we predicate plurality of the active persons. The activity of each is not divided and separate; but whatever is done, be it God's providential love for us or His government and direction of the world, is done by the three, nor are the things done threefold, *οὐ μὴν τρία ἐστὶν τὰ γινόμενα*[2].» There is a difference, therefore, between the manner in which the three divine persons respectively have the one divine activity *ad extra*, and their immanent mutual relations. Gregory often refers to this[3]. He lays all possible stress on one point: the distinction of three divine persons consists in their immanent relations. He explains with amazing clearness and precision the relations of the Holy Spirit to the Father and the Son. «Should any one», he says toward the end of the treatise addressed to Ablabius[4], «object against our teaching that by the denial of any difference in nature we confuse and commingle the hypostases, we reply that, while firmly adhering to the identity of nature *(τὸ ἀπαράλλαχτον τῆς φύσεως)*, we

[1] Ib., xlv. 180. [2] Ib., xlv. 125.

[3] Ep. 5 ad Sebastenos: *Migne*, PG., xlvi. 1032; Serm. adv. Macedonianos, n. 19: ib., xlv. 1325.

[4] *Migne*, PG., xlv. 133.

do not deny the distinction between the principle and what proceeds from it. We find this distinction between them; we believe that the one is the principle and that the other is from the principle, and in what is from the principle we find another distinction. For the one is from the first immediately *(προσεχῶς)*, the other only mediately and through that which is immediately from the first, so that the characteristic note of Only-begotten, *τὸ μονογενές*, belongs undoubtedly to the Son. On the other hand it is certain that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father, for, while the mediation of the Son requires for Him the character of Only-begotten, it does so without taking from the Holy Spirit his natural relation to the Father.» In the *Sermo adv. Macedonianos,* n. 2[1], he states the ecclesiastical faith as follows: «We confess that the Holy Spirit is co-ordinate, *συντετάχθαι*, with the Father and the Son, so that between them there is absolutely no difference as regards all things that can be thought and said in a God-fearing way concerning the divine nature, save that the Holy Spirit is a distinct hypostasis, *καθ' ὑπόστασιν ἰδιαζόντως θεωρεῖσθαι,* because He is from God, *ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ*, and is of Christ, *τοῦ Χριστοῦ*, as it is written (John xv. 26; Rom. viii. 9; Phil. i. 19; Gal. iv. 6), in this way that He does not share either with the Father in the property of not proceeding *(τὸ ἀγέννητον)*, or with the Son in the property of the Only-begotten.» He frequently calls the Son the glory, *δόξα*, of the Father, and the Holy Spirit the glory of the Son[2]. Gregory never treats of such questions as the manner in which the three persons proceed in the one divine nature or from the divine intellect and will, nor what it is that constitutes the three hypostases three distinct persons.

8. GREGORY'S VIEWS ON THE RESURRECTION AND THE FUTURE LIFE. — In his works on the creation of man, and on the soul and the resurrection (*De hominis opificio, De anima et resurrectione* etc.). Gregory teaches that man is the link between two distinct and mutually opposed worlds, the focus in which the world of the spirit and the world of the senses meet. The soul is not prior to the body, as Origen maintained, nor does it begin to exist after the body, as now and then some have inferred from the biblical account of creation[3]; the two constitutive elements of human nature come into existence at one and the same moment[4] Thenceforward they are and remain most intimately united; even death does not interrupt completely their mutual relations; their temporary separation is followed by an indissoluble reunion. He explains as follows[5] the ecclesiastical doctrine of the identity of the present body with that of

[1] *Migne,* PG., xlv. 1304.

[2] Contra Eunom., lib. 1: *Migne,* PG., xlv. 372; Serm. adv. Maced., n. 20: ib., xlv. 1328.

[3] De hom. opif., c. 28. [4] Ib., c. 29. [5] Ib., c. 27.

the resurrection: «Since the soul is possessed of a certain natural inclination and love towards the body that once was its own, there continues to dwell (in the departed soul) a secret fondness for and a knowledge of its own property, *τοῦ οἰκείου σχέσις τε καὶ ἐπίγνωσις*. Now in every such body there are inherent certain natural signs by reason of which the common matter remains distinct, and distinguishable by these peculiarities. It is not, therefore, unreasonable to believe that in the resurrection our bodies will separate themselves from the common matter and return to their special forms of being. This will appear more clearly if we observe more closely our own nature. Our essence, *τὸ ἡμέτερον*, is not entirely subject to motion and change; it would be perfectly unintelligible if there were not in it something essential that never changed. Closer observation shows that there are in us a changeable and a permanent element. The body changes through growth and decay but its form, *τὸ εἶδος*, remains unchanged. Now, since this form remains with the soul like the impress of a seal, that (portion of matter) which has already left upon the soul the impress of its image (form), can never be unknown to the soul; on the contrary, in the hour of final restoration of all things, *τῆς ἀναστοιχειώσεως*, the soul takes again to itself what corresponds to the image of the form, but what was originally stamped with the form certainly corresponds to this image.» In the treatise on the soul and the resurrection[1] and in the discourse «on the dead»[2] he treats more particularly of the body of the resurrection. For a long time there has been much opposition to his views concerning the great difference that will exist among the arisen and its final cessation. «Not everything», says he[3], «that returns to existence by the resurrection will enter upon the same life as before. Rather is there a great difference between those who have been purified and those who still stand in need of purification. Those who have been cleansed from the filth of iniquity through the water of the sacrament, *διὰ τοῦ ὕδατος τοῦ μυστικοῦ*, need no other purification, *τοῦ ἑτέρου τῶν καθαρσίων εἴδους*, while those who have never received that sacramental cleansing, *οἱ ταύτης ἀμύητοι τῆς καθάρσεως*, must necessarily be purged through fire.» Finally, however, all nature must, by an unavoidable necessity, return to its original happy and divine and painless condition, *ἡ ἐπὶ τὸ μακάριόν τε καὶ θεῖον καὶ πάσης κατηφείας κεχωρισμένον ἀποκατάστασις*[4]. When after long ages, the evil which now in all creatures has permeated nature, has been extirpated from it, and the restoration to their original condition takes place, *ἡ εἰς τὸ ἀρχαῖον ἀποκατάστασις τῶν νῦν ἐν κακίᾳ κειμένων*, of all those who

[1] De an. et resurr.: *Migne*, PG., xlvi. 148 ff.
[2] Or. de mortuis: Ib., xlvi. 529 ff.
[3] Or. catech., c. 35: Ib., xlv. 92; cf. c. 8. [4] Ib, c. 35.

now lie sunk in evil, then shall every creature intone a chant of thanksgiving to the Redeemer; even the inventor of evil, *ὁ εὑρετὴς τοῦ κακοῦ*, will have a part in this hymn of thanksgiving[1] In such phrases he maintains, apparently, a general restoration *(Apocatastasis)* to divine favor of all sinful creatures; the pains of hell have, therefore, only a medicinal significance, and are not eternal but temporary. Indeed, he repeats these views in his dialogue *De an. et resurr.* At the end of time, he says in this dialogue, all without exception will enjoy the divine bounty i. e. will live in God[2]; the distinction between a virtuous and an evil life will then consist chiefly *(μάλιστα)* in the more or less rapid *(θᾶττον ἢ σχολαιότερον)* realization of the hapiness that we hope for[3]. In his discourse *De mortuis* he says that the sinner must be purified in this life «by prayer and philosophy» or in the life to come by the way of purging fire[4] When all shall have been finally cleansed from evil, then shall be resplendent in all the one divine beauty[5]. Nevertheless he often speaks of the pains of hell as eternal. Thus, in the *Oratio catechetica*, c. 40[6], he says expressly that its fire is inextinguishable and speaks of the immortality of «the worm», and of an eternal sanction, *ἡ αἰωνία ἀντίδοσις*; in his Or. c. usurarios[7] he threatens them with eternal suffering, eternal punishment, *αἰώνιος λύπη, ἡ αἰώνιος κόλασις;* in *De castigatione*[8] he speaks of unceasing and inconsolable lamentation through eternity, *τὸν ἄληκτον ὀδυρμὸν καὶ ἀπαραμύθητον εἰς αἰῶνας.* But this «eternity» is elsewhere interpreted by himself in such terms as *ταῖς μακραῖς περιόδοις*[9], *τοῖς καθήκουσιν χρόνοις, μακραῖς ποτε περιόδοις*[10]. The hypothesis of Germanus of Constantinople (§ 107, 5) that the writings of Gregory had been interpolated at a later date is therefore both useless and gratuitous. Gregory could not imagine an eternal estrangement from God of his intellectual creatures. God cannot completely alienate himself from them. By an intrinsic necessity they must one day turn away from evil and cling to the good and the divine with which their own nature stands in such close kinship[11].

9. EDITIONS OF HIS WRITINGS. — The writings of Gregory of Nyssa have hitherto been rather strangely neglected. There is no complete edition that satisfies even the most modest demands. In modern times *G. H. Forbes* and *Fr. Oehler* undertook the task of producing such an edition; S. P. N. Gregorii Nysseni Basilii M. fratris quae supersunt omnia, in unum corpus collegit, ad fidem codd. mss. recensuit, latinis versionibus quam accuratissimis instruxit et genuina a supposititiis discrevit Gregorius H. Forbesius,

[1] Or. catech., c. 26. [2] *Migne,* PG., xlvi. 152.
[3] Ib., xlvi. 152 157—160. [4] Ib., xlvi. 524 525.
[5] Ib., xlvi. 536. [6] Ib., xlv. 105. [7] Ib., xlvi., 436 452.
[8] Ib., xlvi. 312. [9] Or. catech., c. 26: ib., xlv. 69.
[10] De an. et resurr.: ib., xlvi. 152 157.
[11] De hom. opif., c. 21: ib., xliv. 201.

Burntisland, 1855 1861, but only two fascicles of the first volume of this edition were printed containing; pp. 1—95: Apologia in Hexaemeron; pp. 96 to 319: De conditione hominis; pp. 320—350: De vita Moysis (a part only), with an extensive critical apparatus. Of Oehler's edition only the first volume was printed: S. Gregorii episc. Nysseni opera, ex recensione Francisci Oehler, tomus I, continens libros dogmaticos, Halle, 1865, pp. 1—454: Libri XII contra Eunomium; pp. 455—595: Confutatio alterius libri Eunomii [?]; pp. 597 to 673: Adnotatio. The text-criticism is defective. The best of the earlier editions is that of *Fronto Ducaeus,* S. J., Paris, 1615, 2 vols. An ample appendix, compiled by *J. Gretser,* S. J., Paris, 1618, was incorporated in the second edition of Ducaeus († Sept. 25., 1624), Paris, 1638, 3 vols. Other «inedita» of Gregory of Nyssa were made known by *L. A. Zacagni,* Collectanea monumentorum veterum ecclesiae graecae ac latinae, Rome, 1698, i; by *J. B. Caracciolo,* S. P. N. Gregorii episc. Nyssae epistolae septem, Florence, 1731, and by *A. Mai,* Script. vet. nova coll. viii, Rome, 1833, part 2, and Nova Patr. Bibl. iv, Rome, 1847, part 1. Some already known writings were re-edited by *J. G. Krabinger,* with the aid of new codices. the dialogue De anima et resurr., Leipzig, 1837; the Orat. catech. (and the Orat. funebris in Miletium ep., Antioch, xlvi. 852—864), Munich, 1838; the five homilies on the Lord's Prayer, Landshut, 1840. For the Or. catech. see *J. H. Srawley,* The Mss. and Text of the Or. Catech. of Gregory of Nyssa, in Journal of Theological Studies (1902), iii. 421—428; *Id.,* New ed. of Orat. Catech., Cambridge, 1903. *G. Mercati,* Varia Sacra (Testi e Studi 11), Rome, 1903, pp. 57—70, claims Ep. 189 among the letters of Basil. Magn. as the work of our Gregory. He also edited it anew, ib., pp. 71—82, with the aid of hitherto unknown texts. The most complete collection of the writings of Gregory is in *Migne,* PG., xliv—xlvi, Paris, 1838, but these volumes have no critical value. For extracts from the De vita Moysis taken from newly discovered papyrus-codices see *H. Landwehr,* Griechische Handschriften aus Fayyûm, in Philologus (1885), xliv; cf. pp. 19—21.

10. TRANSLATIONS. — In the sixth century Dionysius Exiguus translated into Latin the work of Gregory on the constitution of man (De conditione hominis, in *Migne,* PL., lxvii. 345—408). A Syriac version of the Explanation of the beginning of the Lord's Prayer was edited by *P. Zingerle,* in Monumenta syriaca ex romanis codicibus collecta, Innsbruck, 1869, i. 111—116. A German version of several important writings was published, with the Greek text, by *Fr Oehler,* in his Bibliothek der Kirchenväter, Leipzig, 1858—1859, part I (the only one). A German recension with critical notes, of the treatise De anima et resurrectione, is owing to *H. Schmidt,* Halle, 1864. There appeared, in the Kempten Bibliothek der Kirchenväter, German translations of the following: Life of St. Macrina, his sister; Great Catechesis; Treatise on the constitution of man; Dialogue with his sister Macrina on the soul and the resurrection (translations of *H. Hayd,* 1874); the moral discourses, Panegyrics, and funeral orations were translated by *J. Fisch,* ib., 1880. Selected discourses in German version by *F. J. Winter,* in *Leonhardi-v. Langsdorff,* Die Predigt der Kirche, Leipzig, 1895, xxix. Many of his writings are translated into English by *Schaff,* A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church, New York, 1893, series II, v.

11. SPURIOUS WORKS. ASTERIUS OF AMASEA. NEMESIUS OF EMESA. — The two spurious Orationes in Scripturae verba: faciamus hominem ad imaginem et similitudinem nostram (*Migne,* PG., xliv. 257—298) are found under another title in the editions of the works of St. Basil (§ 67, 11).

The Or. II de resurr. Domini (Ib., xlvi. 627—652) belongs to the Monophysite Severus of Antioch (§ 102, 2). Cf. *A. Baumstark,* in Röm. Quartalschr. für christl. Altertumskunde (1897), xi. 32. The treatise or fragment De eo quid sit ad imaginem Dei et ad similitudinem (Ib., xliv. 1328—1345) seems to be spurious. Cf. *J. B. Kumpfmüller,* De Anastasio Sinaita, Würzburg, 1865, pp. 150—151. The ten syllogisms against the Manichæans (Contra Manichaeos Oratio: Ib., xlvi. 541) are, as *Fessler* (Instit. Patrol., 1850—1851, i. 595) saw, taken literally from the treatise of Didymus the Blind against the Manichæans (§ 70. 2). On the Ep. 26 ad Evagrium monachum de divinitate (*Migne,* PG., xlvi. 1101—1108), which probably belongs to the works of Gregory of Nazianzus, see § 47, 5 and 68, 5. Two homilies, Adhortatio ad poenitentiam and In principium ieiuniorum, formerly attributed to our Saint (Ib., xlvi. 539), are now known to be works of his contemporary, St. Asterius, metropolitan of Amasea in Pontus about the end of the fourth century. To the same Asterius (*Migne,* PG., xl. 164—477) are ascribed 21 homilies — among them the abovementioned 13 and 14 — most of which are devoted to interpretation of Scriptural passages (e. g. Hom. 6 in Danielem et Susannam) or to the glorification of the Saints. On earlier editions of these homilies cf. *Fessler-Jungmann,* Instit. Patr., i. 624. *L. Koch,* Asterius, Bischof von Amasea, in Zeitschr. f. die histor. Theol. (1871), xli. 77—107. For a Sylloge historica on Asterius see *V. de Buck,* in Acta Ss. Oct., Paris, 1883, xiii. 330—334. The treatise on the soul printed among the works of Gregory of Nyssa (περὶ ψυχῆς: Ib., xlv. 188—221) is only a fragment (cc. 2 and 3) of the work of Nemesius «On the nature of man» (περὶ φύσεως ἀνθρώπου. Ib., xl. 504—817). Nemesius, it is generally believed, was bishop of Emesa in Phoenicia in the early part of the fifth century. His work belongs really to the history of philosophy; in it he chiefly discusses psychological questions and is strongly influenced by Neoplatonist thoughts. In the Middle Ages it was much read and was translated into several languages. Its manuscript tradition is discussed by *K. J. Burkhard,* in Wiener Studien (1888), x. 93—135; (1889), xi. 143—152 243—267; cf. (1893), xv. 192—199. *Migne* (l. c.) reprints the latest edition, that of *Chr. Fr. Matthaei,* Halle, 1802. A Latin version, made probably by Alfanus, archbishop of Salerno († 1085), was published by *C. Holzinger,* Leipzig and Prague, 1887; cf. *Cl. Bäumker,* in Wochenschr. f. klass. Phil. (1896), pp. 1095—1102. Another Latin version, made in 1159 by the Pisan jurist Johannes Burgundio, was edited (in part) by *K. J. Burkhard,* Vienna, 1891—1896 (two progr.), and 1901 (Progr.). Cf. *M. Evangelides,* Nemesius und seine Quellen, Berlin, 1882. *B. Domanski,* Die Psychologie des Nemesius, Münster, 1900 (Beiträge zur Gesch. der Philosophie des Mittelalters, iii. 1). *J. Dräseke,* in Zeitschr. f. wissenschaftl. Theol. (1901), xliv. 391—410, attributes to Nemesius the περὶ τοῦ καταφρονεῖν τὸν θάνατον, current under the name of Demetrius Cydonius (*Migne,* PG., cliv, 1169—1212) and re-edited by *H. Weckelmann,* Leipzig, 1901.

12. WORKS ON GREGORY OF NYSSA. — *J. Rupp,* Gregors, des Bischofs von Nyssa, Leben und Meinungen, Leipzig, 1834. *St. P. Heyns,* Disputatio historico-theologica de Gregorio Nysseno, Leyden, 1835. *Fr. Böhringer,* Die Kirche Christi und ihre Zeugen oder die Kirchengeschichte in Biographien, 2. ed., viii: 1. Die drei Kappadozier, 2. Gregor von Nyssa, 3. Gregor von Nazianz. Stuttgart, 1876. *E. G. Möller,* Gregorii Nysseni doctrinam de hominis natura et illustravit et cum Origeniana comparavit E. G. M., Halle, 1854. *J. N. Stigler,* Die Psychologie des hl. Gregor von Nyssa, Ratisbon, 1857. *L. Kleinheidt,* S. Gregorii episc. Nysseni doctrina de angelis, Freiburg, 1860. *Al. Vincenzi,* In S. Gregorii Nysseni et Origenis scripta et doctrinam nova recensio, cum appendice de actis

synodi V oecum., Rome, 1864—1869, 5 vols. *H. Weiss,* Die grossen Kappadozier Basilius, Gregor von Nazianz und Gregor von Nyssa als Exegeten, Brunsberg, 1872. *A. Krampf,* Der Urzustand des Menschen nach der Lehre des hl. Gregor von Nyssa, Würzburg, 1889. *Fr. Hilt,* Des hl. Gregor von Nyssa Lehre vom Menschen systematisch dargestellt, Cologne, 1890. *J. Bauer,* Die Trostreden des Gregorius von Nyssa in ihrem Verhältnis zur antiken Rhetorik (Inaug.-Diss.). Marburg, 1892. *Fr. Diekamp,* Die Gotteslehre des hl. Gregor von Nyssa, Münster, 1896, i. *A. Reiche,* Die künstlerischen Elemente in der Welt- und Lebensanschauung des Gregor von Nyssa (Inaug.-Diss.), Jena, 1897. *W Vollert,* Die Lehre Gregors von Nyssa vom Guten und Bösen und von der schliesslichen Überwindung des Bösen, Leipzig, 1897 *H. Koch,* Das mystische Schauen beim hl. Gregor von Nyssa, in Theol. Quartalschr. (1898), lxxx. 397—420. *E. Michaud,* St. Grégoire de Nysse et l'Apocatastase, in Revue internationale de Théologie (1902), pp. 37—52. *K. Unterstein,* Die natürliche Gotteserkenntnis nach der Lehre der kappadozischen Kirchenväter Basilius, Gregor von Nazianz und Gregor von Nyssa (Progr.), Strassburg, 1902—1903. *K. Weiss,* Die Erziehungslehre der Kappadozier etc., Freiburg, 1903.

### § 70. Didymus the Blind.

1. HIS LIFE. — Didymus, surnamed «the Blind», is one of the most notable men of an age that abounded in great personalities. He was born at Alexandria about 310, and lost his sight while yet young, at the age of four according to Palladius[1], after his fifth year (post quintum nativitatis suae annum), says St. Jerome[2]. Rufinus writes as follows[3] concerning Didymus:

Miscebat tamen precibus studia ac laborem et iuges continuatasque vigilias non ad legendum, sed ad audiendum adhibebat, ut, quod aliis visus, hoc illi conferret auditus. Cum vero post lucubrationis laborem somnus, ut fieri solet, legentibus advenisset, Didymus silentium illud non ad quietem vel otium datum ducens, tamquam animal ruminans cibum quem ceperat ex integro revocabat et ea quae dudum percurrentibus aliis ex librorum lectione cognoverat memoria et animo retexebat, ut non tam audisse quae lecta fuerant quam descripsisse ea mentis suae paginis videretur. Ita brevi Deo docente in tantam divinarum humanarumque rerum eruditionem ac scientiam venit, ut scholae ecclesiasticae doctor exsisteret sed et in ceteris sive dialecticae sive geometriae, astronomiae quoque vel arithmeticae disciplinis esset paratus.

He was president of the catechetical school of Alexandria for more than a half century; Rufinus and Jerome were among his disciples. He remained a layman, and was married; his death probably occurred about 395. Didymus was strongly influenced by his great predecessor Origen, not only in his exegetical method, but in his doctrinal views. In later times he was anathematized as an Origenist, i. e. a believer in the pre-existence of the soul and in the Apocatastasis. In March or April 553 the bishops who had gathered at Constantinople for the fifth General Council (May 5. to June 2. 553)

[1] τετραέτης, in Hist. Laus., c. 4. [2] Chron. ad a. Abr. 2388.
[3] Hist. eccl., ii. 7.

condemned Origen and the Origenistic doctrines of Didymus the Blind and the deacon Evagrius Ponticus († about 399). Other General Councils (sixth, seventh, and eighth) repeated the anathema of the fifth against Origen, Didymus and Evagrius.

2. WRITINGS OF DIDYMUS. — The extant works of Didymus are partly dogmatic and partly exegetical. The most important is his work on the Trinity, *περὶ τριάδος*[1], in three books found by J. A. Mingarelli in a somewhat incomplete and very faulty codex of the eleventh century, and published by him in 1769. This work was written (after 379) against Arianism. St. Jerome, who knew well the Origenistic tendency of the author[2], says rightly that in this treatise he is undoubtedly orthodox *(certe in trinitate catholicus est)*[3]. An earlier work on the Holy Spirit *(De Spiritu Sancto)* is considered a supplement of the work on the Trinity, principally of the second book of it. It has reached us only in the sixty-three brief chapters of St. Jerome's Latin translation[4] When Pope Damasus requested the latter to compose a work on the Catholic doctrine concerning the Holy Spirit, he preferred, as he says in the preface, *alieni operis interpres exsistere quam, ut quidam faciunt, alienis se coloribus adornare.* This work is, indeed, one of the best of its kind in Christian antiquity. Less important is the tractate against the Manichæans, *κατὰ Μανιχαίων*[5]. Its eighteen chapters have reached us in the original text, but apparently in an imperfect condition. He is very probably also the author of the last two books of the alleged work of St. Basil's *Adversus Eunomium;* for they seem to be a compendium[6] of the two books of Didymus' *De dogmatibus et contra Arianos* (cf. 67, 4, 13). He wrote many other works, dogmatic, polemic, and apologetic in character, that have been lost or still await discovery Among these is a work devoted to the exposition and defence of Origen's *περὶ ἀρχῶν (ὑπομνήματα εἰς τὰ περὶ ἀρχῶν Ὠριγένους).* In his exegetical writings Didymus was a slavish follower of Origen in his allegorico-mystical method of interpretation; but only a few fragments, however, have been saved from his many prolix commentaries. The most complete of them is the exposition of the canonical Epistles *(In Epistolas canonicas enarratio*[7]*)*; and even that has reached us only in the Latin version and recension of Epiphanius the Scholastic, undertaken at the suggestion of Cassiodorus. The genuineness of this commentary, though denied, has been defended with success by J. A. Cramer in his edition of the Catena of Greek on the Canonical Epistles (Oxford, 1840). It is here that the Origenism of the author reaches its frankest expression. Mai found

[1] *Migne,* PG., xxxix. 269—992. [2] Adv. *Rufin.,* i. 6; ii. 11.
[3] Ib., ii. 16; cf. iii. 27.
[4] *Migne,* PG., xxxix. 1031—1086; PL., xxiii. 101—154.
[5] *Migne,* PG., xxxix. 1085—1110. [6] *Hier.,* De viris ill., c. 109.
[7] *Migne,* xxxix. 1749—1818.

in a Catena and published (1847) numerous *scholia* of Didymus to Second Corinthians[1]; he also found and published (1854) remnants of *scholia* on all the Psalms[2] attributed to Didymus, and probably remnants of a complete commentary on the Old Testament. In detail, however, the genuineness of these Mai fragments is still open to discussion. It may be said that their author was certainly an Alexandrine, that he is a pronounced allegorist, and seeks in most of the Psalms a Messianic sense and a mystico-ascetic teaching. Mai also published at the same time some fragments of the Commentary on Proverbs[3].

3. WORKS ON DIDYMUS. — For details of the ecclesiastical condemnation of Didymus and Evagrius cf. *Fr. Diekamp*, Die origenistischen Streitigkeiten im 6. Jahrhundert etc., Münster, 1899, pp. 131 f. *Ferd. Mingarellius*, Veterum testimonia de Didymo Alexandrino Coeco, ex quibus tres libri de Trinitate nuper detecti eidem asseruntur. Cum animadv., Rome, 1764. Didymi Alex. libri tres de Trinitate. Nunc primum graece et lat. ac cum notis ed. *J. Aloys. Mingarellius*, Bologne, 1769; the «Veterum testimonia» printed at the beginning of this edition were all collected by Mingarelli's brother. Didymi Alex. praeceptoris S. Hieronymi in omnes Epist. canon. enarratio, nunquam antehac edita. Acc. eiusdem de Spiritu S. ex Hieron. interpr., Cologne, 1531. A critical edition of the very corrupt text of this «Enarratio», with addition of a new original fragments, was issued by *G. Chr. Fr. Lücke*, Quaestiones ac vindiciae Didymianae, Göttingen, 1829—1832 (4 Univ. progr.). The scholia to Second Corinthians are in *Mai*, Nova Patr. Bibl., iv 2, 115—146, where there is an appendix (pp. 147—152) of commentary-fragments by Didymus on the fourth Gospel, not edited by *B. Corderius*, S. J., in his Catena on that Gospel, Antwerp, 1630. *J. Chr. Wolf* edited from a Catena some fragments of a commentary on the Acts of the Apostles: Anecdota Graeca, Hamburg, 1724, iv. For the scholia on the Psalms cf. *Mai*, vii 2, 131 to 311 (note the fragment on the title of Ps. iv. in *Mai*, l. c., iii 1, 456; 2, 284). The fragments on Proverbs are in *Mai*, l. c., vii 2, 57—71. *Corderius* had already printed some fragments of a Didymus-commentary on the Psalms, Antwerp, 1643—1646; *J. A. Mingarelli* published others at Bologna, 1784. *P. Junius (Patrick Young)* made known some fragments on Job: Catena Graec. Patr. in beatum Job, London, 1637. Other fragments on Genesis, Exodus, and 2 Kings became known by the publication at Leipzig, 1772—1773, of the Catena of Nicephorus on the Octateuch and the Books of Kings. All these editions are found in *Migne*, PG., xxxix. A Latin scholion to Gen. i. 27, in *Pitra*, Spicilegium Solesm., i. 284, is attributed to Didymus. According to Dräseke, Didymus was also the author of the first of the two books against Apollinaris printed in the editions of Saint Athanasius: *J. Dräseke*, Zu Didymus von Alexandriens' Schrift «über die Trinität». Mitteilungen aus Albert Jahns Nachlass, in Zeitschr. f. wissenschaftl. Theol. (1902), xlv. 410—416. *Th. Schermann*, Lateinische Parallelen zu Didymus, in Röm. Quartalschr. (1902), xvi. 232—242 (see also § 63, 3 10).

4. EVAGRIUS PONTICUS. — Evagrius called Ponticus, perhaps from his native province, was born in Pontus about 345, and about 380 was ordained

[1] Ib., xxxix. 1679—1732. [2] Ib., xxxix. 1155—1616.
[3] Ib., xxxix. 1621—1646.

deacon by Gregory of Nyssa, whom he accompanied to the Second Ecumenical Council of Constantinople (381), where he remained for some years with the patriarch Nectarius (381—397). He was moved to leave that city by the dangers which his virtue encountered; after a short stay in Jerusalem he betook himself to Egypt, where he followed the monastic rule, first in the Nitrian Desert, and then in the great monastery known as τὰ κελλία. He is said to have steadfastly refused an episcopal see offered him by Theophilus of Alexandria. He died in the desert at the age of 54, highly esteemed both as an ascetic and a writer (cf. *Pallad.*, Hist. Laus., c. 86). Evagrius was well-known already during his life as an Origenist. Jerome reproaches him with Origenistic opinions, and calls him a forerunner of Pelagius (Ep. 133 ad Ctesiphontem, n. 3; Dial. adv. Pelag., prol.; Comm. in Jer., iv, prol.). We have already stated (see no. 1) that at a later date he was condemned as an adherent of the pre-existence of the soul and of the Apocatastasis. His writings were put into Latin by Rufinus (*Hier.*, Ep. 133, 3) and by Gennadius (*Gennad.*, De viris ill., c. 11), and perhaps about the same time translated by others into Syriac. Only a few brief and broken fragments have reached us. *Gallandi* was the first to make a critical collection of them, in Bibl. vet. Patr. vii. 551—581 (cf. xx—xxii). His edition is reproduced in *Migne*, PG., xl., and begins with the works first discovered (1686) by *J. B. Cotelier:* μοναχὸς ἢ περὶ πρακτικῆς (Monachus seu de vita activa), and the τῶν κατὰ μοναχῶν πραγμάτων τὰ αἴτια καὶ ἡ καθ' ἡσυχίαν τούτων παράθεσις (Rerum monachalium rationes earumque iuxta quietem adpositio). Both *Cotelier* and *Gallandi* give only fragments and excerpts of the μοναχός. Another corresponding work mentioned by *Socrates* (Hist. eccl., iv. 23): γνωστικὸς ἢ περὶ τῶν καταξιωθέντων γνώσεως (?) has perished. Then follow various collections of apophthegms, rules of life and aphorisms, which are only partly extant in Latin; while in the Greek text they are also current under the name of St. Nilus. The tractate περὶ τῶν ὀκτὼ λογισμῶν (De octo vitiosis cogitationibus) is obviously a remnant of the collection of scriptural texts made by Evagrius in self-defence against various (8) temptations as recorded above by Socrates (l. c.) and Gennadius (l. c.); for a new edition of it cf. *A. Elter*, Gnomica, Leipzig, 1892, i. In an appendix to *Zöckler's* Evagrius Ponticus (Munich, 1893), *Fr. Baethgen* published a German translation of a Syriac fragment from a (lost) larger work of Evagrius on the eight evil thoughts. If Evagrius did not invent the theory of the eight vices, he is at least the first known representative of it, and was thereby the forerunner of the doctrine of the seven capital sins. It is very doubtful that the scholion εἰς τὸ ΠΙΠΙ (in *Gallandi* and *Migne* at the last place) belongs to Evagrius; its latest editor is *P de Lagarde*, Onamastica Sacra, Göttingen, 1870, i. 205—206 (2. ed. 1887). It treats of the ten Jewish names of God and in particular of the sacred tetragram; ΠΙΠΙ (in some codices πιπι), is a reproduction of the Hebrew letters יהוה (read from left to right). Cf. *E. Nestle*, in Zeitschr. der deutschen Morgenl. Gesellschaft (1878), xxxii. 465 ff. *O. Zöckler*, Evagrius Pontikus, Münich, 1893 (*Zöckler*, Biblische und kirchenhistorische Studien, fasc. iv). Cf. *J. Dräseke*, Zu Euagrios Pontikos, in Zeitschr. f. wissensch. Theol. (1894), xxxvii. 125—137.

### § 71. St. Epiphanius.

1. HIS LIFE. — Epiphanius was born about 315 in a hamlet near Eleutheropolis in Judæa, and devoted himself from early youth to the study of the sacred sciences. At the same time he took up with special zeal the study of foreign languages, and according to St. Je-

rome[1] became a master of Greek, Syriac, Hebrew and Egyptian (Coptic), to some extent also of Latin. The holy monk Hilarion exercised much influence over the Palestinian youth, and it was probably his exhortations that led Epiphanius to visit Egypt in search of more advanced instruction. He frequented there the society of the most famous monks, and came also into contact with the Gnostics, who made vain efforts to win him over to their heresy When about twenty years of age he returned to his native land and founded a monastery near Eleutheropolis over which he presided for some thirty years, in the course of which time he was ordained to the priesthood. The fame of his learning and piety induced the bishops of Cyprus to choose him in 367 as their metropolitan and bishop of Constantia, the ancient Salamina. In this capacity he became distinguished for his mortified and holy life, for his activity in the spread of monasticism, and for his fiery zeal in defence of the purity of ecclesiastical doctrine. Indeed, this zeal is the distinguishing mark of Epiphanius. It is true that it was not always coupled with calmness and moderation nor with a deep knowledge of the world and of men, hence the troubles that darkened the latter years of his life. He had always been a strong opponent of Origenism, both in his writings and his discourses. It was with the intention of pursuing, to one of its principal centres, a heresy which seemed to him exceedingly dangerous that in 394 he visited Jerusalem, the home of Origen's most determined and influential admirers. Among them were John II., bishop of the city, Jerome who lived in Bethlehem, and Rufinus, their friend and guest. In presence of the bishop and a great multitude assembled in the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, Epiphanius delivered a discourse against Origen and his errors. When John refused to condemn the Alexandrine, Epiphanius broke off ecclesiastical communion with him. Rufinus sided with John, while Jerome took the part of *papa Epiphanius* πεντάγλωττος[2] whom he held in great veneration. Fresh fuel was added to the flame when Paulinian, brother of St. Jerome, was ordained a priest by Epiphanius, at a place not far from Eleutheropolis, in the diocese of Jerusalem, and against the will of the bishop. It was several years before a reconciliation was effected through the efforts of Theophilus, patriarch of Alexandria, at that time very Origenistic in his views. Shortly after, in 399, the artful Theophilus declared himself to be strongly opposed to Origenism and took violent measures against those Egyptian monks who adhered to the cause of Origen. When thereby he became involved in difficulties with St. Chrysostom, he called on Epiphanius as an ally against the bishop of Constantinople whom he held up as a defender of Origen. It was probably in 402 that Epiphanius summoned to a synod the bishops of Cyprus, and

[1] Adv. *Rufin.*, ii. 22. [2] Ib., iii. 6.

condemned Origen and his writings. Soon after, despite his advanced age, he listened to the suggestions of Theophilus and went to Constantinople, in order to wage war in person against the Origenists of that city The well-meaning but short-sighted old man was very active in the beginning against Chrysostom; soon, however, he was convinced of his error, and recognized that he had been used as a tool by Theophilus. Without waiting for the Council of the Oak (§ 74, 4) he took ship for Cyprus and died at sea, May 12., 403.

2. POLEMICAL WRITINGS. — The writings of Epiphanius are nearly all devoted to the refutation of heresy. He had often been requested by admirers from Syedra in Pamphylia, to write a large work in which they might find explained the true and sound faith concerning the holy Trinity and particularly the Holy Ghost, and he yielded in 374 and wrote the *ἀγκυρωτός*[1] i. e. «the firmly-anchored man». Its purpose, from which it often wanders very widely, is to afford a solid anchorage to those of the faithful who are cast about on the waves of Arian and Semiarian conflict. The two Professions of faith with which the work ends were addressed to the community of Syedra, to be used in baptism, and deserve great attention. Caspari has shown that the second and longer profession (c. 120) was composed on this occasion by Epiphanius himself, while the first and shorter one (c. 119) is a baptismal creed of earlier origin and was introduced as such into the metropolitan see of Constantia, not long before the election of St. Epiphanius. It was then accepted with a few modifications by the Second Ecumenical Council of Constantinople (381) and became thereby the Profession of faith of the Universal Church, indeed the baptismal creed of the whole East. Two readers of the *ἀγκυρωτός*, Acacius and Paulus, found it so interesting and useful that they begged the author for a more detailed and exhaustive work on the systems of the heretics. It was thus that he came to write (374—377) the «medecine-chest», *πανάριον* or *πανάρια*, against eighty heresies[2], usually cited as *Haereses*. The work proposes to furnish an antidote to those who have been bitten by the serpent of heresy and to protect those whose faith has remained sound. Epiphanius reckons among the heresies also the Greek philospohical schools and the religious sects of the Jews, so that twenty of the above-mentioned heresies belong to a pre-Christian period. He is indebted to SS. Justin, Irenæus and Hippolytus for his description of the earlier heresies, and often for the very words he uses. His accounts of the later heresies are drawn from many scattered sources and offer rich historical materials, although his credulity and lack of critical acumen are often only too patent. He probably borrowed the number of «eighty» heresies from the «four score concubines» in the Canticle of canticles (vi. 7). The work

[1] *Migne,* PG., xliii. 17—236. [2] Ib., xli xlii.

closes with a synoptic exposition of the Catholic and Apostolic Church *(σύντομος ἀληθὴς λόγος περὶ πίστεως καθολικῆς καὶ ἀποστολικῆς ἐκκλησίας)*. We must perhaps attribute to a later hand an epitome of this work, *ἀνακεφαλαίωσις*[1], containing the text of passages that seemed especially important.

3. BIBLICO-ARCHÆOLOGICAL WRITINGS. SPURIOUS WRITINGS. LETTERS. — Very valuable for the science of introduction to the Sacred Scriptures is the work on Weights and Measures, *περὶ μέτρων καὶ σταθμῶν*, that he composed at Constantinople in 392 for a Persian priest. The first part treats of the canon and versions of the Old Testament, the second describes the biblical weights and measures, and the third treats of the geography of Palestine. The title, therefore, does not correspond with the contents; and the entire work looks more like a collection of notes ad sketches rather than a finished composition. Of the Greek text only the first twenty-four chapters are extant[2]; sixty other chapters were found in a Syriac version edited by de Lagarde and translated by him into German (and Greek). The treatise on the Twelve precious stones, *περὶ τῶν ιβ' λίθων*, in the breast-plate of the high priest[3] of the Old Testament, is dedicated to Diodorus of Tarsus and has reached us in two recensions, a shorter[4] and a longer one[5] which latter has reached us only in Latin. Other biblico-exegetical writings of Epiphanius have perished. A commentary on the Canticle of canticles, extant in a Latin version and formerly attributed to Epiphanius, is now known not to be his; the Greek text of the work, edited by Giacomelli, claims to be from the hand of Philo, bishop of Carpasia (or Carpasium) in Cyprus who flourished in the early part of the fifth century, and is now generally held to be a work of the latter. A little work on the birth and burial places of all the prophets, preserved in two different recensions[6], filled with impossible fables, is certainly spurious. Similarly, the *Physiologus* (or a recension of it), *εἰς τὸν φυσιολόγον*, the mediæval lexicon or thesaurus of the natural sciences[7]; seven homilies[8], the last of them extant in Latin only, and several other writings are undoubtedly spurious. Of his numerous letters only two have reached us, and those in a Latin version[9], one to John of Jerusalem, the other to St. Jerome, both pertaining to the Origenistic controversies. Pitra published in 1888 Greek fragments of a third letter. The style of Epiphanius is careless, languid, and most verbose.

4. WORKS ON EPIPHANIUS. — There is more legend than history in the life of Epiphanius said to have been written by his disciples Johannes and Polybius (*Migne*, PG., xli). *B. Eberhard*, Die Beteiligung des Epi-

[1] Ib., xlii. 833—886. [2] Ib., xliii. 237—293.
[3] Ex. xxviii. 17—21; xxxix. 10—14. [4] *Migne*, PG., xliii. 293—304.
[5] Ib., xliii. 321—366. [6] Ib., xliii. 393—413 415—428.
[7] Ib., xliii. 517—533. [8] Ib., xliii. 428—508. [9] Ib., xliii. 379—392.

phanius an dem Streite über Origenes, Trier, 1859. *Al. Vincenzi,* Historia critica quaestionis inter Theophilum, Epiphanium et Hieronymum, Origenis adversarios, et inter Joh. Chrysostomum, Theotimum, Ruffinum et monachos Nitrienses, Origenis patronos (In S. Gregorii Nysseni et Origenis scripta et doctrinam nova recensio), Rome, 1865, iii.

5. EDITIONS, COMPLETE AND SPECIAL. TRANSLATIONS. — The original text of the Ancoratus, the Panarium and its Epitome, with the De mensuris et ponderibus was first published by *J. Oporinus,* Basel, 1544. The best complete edition, though in many ways rather faulty, is that of *D. Petavius (Petau),* S. J., Paris, 1622, 2 vols. An enlarged reprint of this edition appeared at Cologne (thus in title, really at Leipzig, 1682). It is reprinted with corrections and additions in *Migne,* PG., xli—xliii, Paris, 1858. In the edition of *W. Dindorf,* Epiphanii episc. Constantiae opera, ed. G. D., Leipzig, 1859—1862, 5 vols., the Greek text has been somewhat improved, but no Latin translation is given; of the spurious writings it contains only the seven homilies and the tractate De numerorum mysteriis (*Migne,* PG., xliii. 507—518). The «Ancoratus» and the «Epitome of the Panarion» were translated into German by *C. Wolfsgruber* (1880), in the Kempten Bibliothek der Kirchenväter. — Separate Editions. a) Polemical works. S. Epiphanii episc. Constantiensis Panaria eorumque Anacephalaeosis. Ad veteres libros recensuit et cum latina Dion. Petavii interpretatione et integris eius animadversionibus edidit *Fr. Oehler,* Berlin, 1859—1861 (Corporis haereseologici ii. 1 2 3; iii. 1). Portions of the Panarium (Epiphanii varia de Graecorum sectis excerpta) are printed in *H. Diels,* Doxographi graeci, Berlin, 1879, pp. 585—593; cf. pp. 175—177 An old Armenian recension of the Anacephalaeosis was edited with commenta by *A. Dashian,* Kurze bibliographische Studien, Untersuchungen und Texte, Vienna, 1895, i. (modern Armenian), 76—146. *R. A. Lipsius,* Zur Quellenkritik des Epiphanios, Vienna, 1865. *Id.,* Die Quellen der ältesten Ketzergeschichte neu untersucht, Leipzig, 1875. The two Creeds published by *Caspari* at the end of the «Ancoratus» were discussed by him in some Danish articles whose contents he summarizes in his Ungedruckte Quellen zur Gesch. des Taufsymbols und der Glaubensregel 1, Christiania, 1886, p. vii; cf. ib., pp. 8—16. — b) Biblico-archæological works etc.: Metrologicorum scriptorum reliquiae. Collegit recensuit partim nunc primum edidit *Fr. Hultsch,* Leipzig, 1864 to 1866, 2 vols. I. (Script. Graeci), pp. 259—267: Excerpta ex Epiphanii libro de mensuris et ponderibus. II. (Script. Romani), pp. 100—106: Vetus versio tractatus Epiphaniani de mensuris et ponderibus. *P. de Lagarde,* Symmikta, Göttingen, 1877, pp. 209—225: Epiphaniana (τοῦ ἁγίου Ἐπιφανίου περὶ μέτρων καὶ σταθμῶν). *Id.,* Veteris Testamenti ab Origene recensiti fragmenta apud Syros servata quinque. Praemittitur Epiphanii de mensuris et ponderibus liber nunc primum integer et ipse syriacus. *P. de Lagarde* edidit, Gött., 1880. *P. de Lagarde,* Symmikta, Göttingen, 1880, ii. 149—216. Des Epiphanius Buch über Masse und Gewichte zum erstenmal vollständig. Lagarde translated into German (and Greek) those portions of the text that have reached us only in the Syriac version. *G. Mercati,* L'età di Simmaco l'interprete e S. Epifanio, Modena, 1892; *Id.,* Sul canone biblico di S. Epifanio (De mens. et pond., c. 23), in Note di letteratura biblica e cristiana antica (Studi e Testi v), Rome, 1901, pp. 17—27. The Latin version of the treatise «On the twelve precious stones» is found at the end of the Collectio Avellana (§ 114, 7), ed. *Günther,* pp. 743—773. Two recensions of the Greek text of the little work on the prophets are printed in *E. Nestle,* Marginalien und Materialien, Tübingen, 1893, part II, pp. 1—64; and the Syriac text (e tribus codicibus Musei Britannici), in *E. Nestle,* Syrische Grammatik, Berlin, 1888, Chrestomatie, pp. 86—107.

For a critical edition of the Physiologus see *Fr. Lauchert,* Geschichte des Physiologus, Strassburg, 1889, pp. 229—279. The pertinent «literature» of the Physiologus may be found in *K. Krumbacher* (Gesch. der byzantinischen Litteratur, 2. ed., München, 1903, pp. 874 ff.). Two fragments of an otherwise unknown letter were edited by *Pitra,* in Analecta sacra et classica (1888), part I, pp. 72—73. *A. Condamin,* Saint Epiphane a-t-il admis la légitimité du divorce pour adultère? in Bullet. de lett. ecclés. (1900), iii. 16—21 (negatively).

6. JOHN (II.) OF JERUSALEM. THEOPHILUS OF ALEXANDRIA. — For John (see no. 1), bishop of Jerusalem (about 386—417), see *C. P Caspari,* Ungedruckte Quellen zur Gesch. des Taufsymbols und der Glaubensregel, Christiania, 1866, i. 161—212 «Ein Glaubensbekenntnis des Bischofs Johannes von Jerusalem (386—417) in syrischer Übersetzung aus einer nitrischen Handschrift des British Museum, samt allem, was uns sonst von Johannes übrig geblieben». — Theophilus (see no. 1), 385—412 patriarch of Alexandria, is characterized by Gibbon (c. 28) as «the perpetual enemy of peace and virtute; a bold, bad man whose hands were alternately polluted with gold and with blood (The history of the decline and fall of the Roman Empire. By *E. Gibbon.* Edited by *W Smith,* London, 1854, iii. 418). He wrote some festal letters (§ 63, 7) and other ecclesiastical documents, also an extensive (lost) work against the Origenists and Anthropomorphites. For the fragments see *Gallandi* (Bibl. vet. Patr. vii. 601 to 652) and the excerpts therefrom in *Migne,* PG., lxv, 33—68. Cf. *Pitra,* Juris eccles. Graecorum hist. et monum., Rome, 1864, i. 646—649. Theophili Alexandrini canones. A few additions to *Gallandi* and *Migne* are found in *Zahn,* Forschungen zur Gesch. des neutestamentl. Kanons und der altkirchl. Literatur, Erlangen, 1883, ii. 234 ff.

7. PHILO OF CARPASIA. — Philo (see no. 3), usually known as bishop of Carpasia (or Carpasium, in Cyprus), according to others bishop of Carpathus (an island between Crete and Rhodus), has hitherto enjoyed but slight repute as a Christian writer. The Greek text of his Enarratio in Canticum canticorum was first published by *M. A. Giacomelli,* Rome, 1772 (reprinted in *Gallandi,* l. c., ix, and in *Migne,* PG., xl). For some other fragments attributed to Philo see *Fabricius-Harles,* Biblioth. Gr., iv. 751—752; x. 479. An ascetical letter of Philo was edited by *A. Papadopulos-Kerameus,* in Ἀνάλεκτα ἱεροσολυμιτικῆς σταχυολογίας, St. Petersburg, 1891, pp. 393—399.

### § 72. Diodorus of Tarsus.

1. LIFE OF DIODORUS. — Diodorus, made in 378 bishop of Tarsus in Cilicia, where he died before 394, belonged to one of the noblest families of Antioch. The highly gifted and industrious youth acquired in the schools of Athens and his native city a solid training in every branch of human and sacred science. At the same time he strove to reach the ideal of Christian perfection by a life of ascetic severity. According to Socrates[1] and Sozomen[2] he divided with Carterius the government of a monastic community *(ἀσκητήριον)* in Antioch or in the neighborhood of that city. The highest tribute to the merits of Diodorus was paid in a letter written by Julian the Apostate and

[1] Hist. eccl., vi. 3. [2] Hist. eccl., viii. 2.

published at a later date (545—551) by Facundus of Hermiane[1]: Diodorus, he said, had equipped his malevolent tongue against the ancient gods with the wisdom of Athens herself, in return, his gaunt figure and pale face, together with his wretched health, were so many evidences of the anger of the Olympians. The emperor's hate had for its source the active and self-sacrificing labors of Diodorus in defence of the Christian faith, notably of the Nicene Creed. The circumstances of the time imposed, at Antioch, on the writings of Diodorus a strongly polemic and apologetic character. Here, the Arians and the orthodox Catholics stood arrayed one against the other in sharp conflict, the former enjoying the imperial favor, first under Constantius (337 to 361), and then under Valens (364—378). In his short reign Julian did all in his power to restore the abandoned worship of the gods. As his winter quarters were at Antioch, during the unfortunate Persian campaign, his influence was proximate and perilous. In all these years, especially during the administration of the Arian bishop Leontius († about 357), and still more during the exile of the patriarch Meletius (360—378), it was Diodorus and his friend Flavian (elected in 381 successor of Meletius) who, amid many sacrifices and dangers, cared for the spiritual welfare of the Syrian metropolis. «Flavian and Diodorus», writes Theodoret[2], «rose like two great rocks in the ocean, on the firm sides of which the towering waves broke in vain. Diodorus, wise and strong, was like a broad, clear river, the waters of which slaked the thirst of his own people, but swept away the blasphemies of his enemies. He esteemed as of no account the splendor of his own origin, and for the sake of the faith bore tribulation with joy». In 372 he had to fly from Antioch, and sojourned for a time with Meletius in Armenia. There he entered into relations with Basil the Great[3]. When Meletius returned to his see (378), the veteran soldier of the faith was made bishop of Tarsus. In this capacity he took part in the Second Ecumenical Council at Constantinople (381). In the imperial edict confirmatory of the Council's decrees, Pelagius of Laodicea and Diodorus of Tarsus are mentioned as the reliable arbiters of orthodoxy.

2. HIS WRITINGS. — Diodorus was a very copious writer, indeed, as a rule all the Antiochene theologians displayed great industry in biblical exegesis. According to Leontius of Byzantium[4] he wrote commentaries on the entire Bible (see the catalogue of his commentaries by *Suidas*)[5]. Apparently only a few remnants of these labors have reached us. At least it is only from the Catenae that the more or less abundant *scholia* on the Septuagint text principally of Genesis and Psalms li—lxxiv, lxxxi—xcv have been rescued. Diodorus was a strenuous opponent of the mystico-allegorical inter-

[1] Pro defens. trium capitum, iv. 2. [2] Hist. eccl., iv. 22.
[3] *Basil.*, Ep. 135. [4] De sectis, iv. 3. [5] Lex. s. v. Diod.

pretation peculiar to the Alexandrines and endeavored to establish firmly the historico-grammatical method. His treatise «On the difference between theory and allegory» *(τίς διαφορὰ θεωρίας καὶ ἀλληγορίας)* is unhappily known to us only through the mention of its title[1]. He certainly developed therein his hermeneutic principles, and very probably refuted the Origenistic exegesis *(ἀλληγορία)*, which denied or pared away the literal sense. In opposition to this tendency he developed the prophetico-typical exposition of Scripture *(θεωρία)*, in which the literal sense is always presupposed and preserved, while the historical foundation of Scripture is never abandoned. He wrote other works of a dogmatic, polemic and apologetic nature. Suidas[2] mentions writings *περὶ τοῦ εἷς θεὸς ἐν τριάδι, κατὰ Μελχισεδεκιτῶν, κατὰ Ἰουδαίων, περὶ νεκρῶν ἀναστάσεως, περὶ ψυχῆς κατὰ διαφόρων, περὶ αὐτῆς αἱρέσεων*, and others. Most of these works are known to us only by their titles. His extensive work against Fate, *κατὰ εἱμαρμένης*, known to Suidas as *κατὰ ἀστρονόμων καὶ ἀστρολόγων καὶ εἱμαρμένης*, was extensively quoted and described at length by Photius[3]. Elsewhere[4] Photius also mentions a work against the Manichæans not found in the list of Suidas; from another work, likewise overlooked by Suidas, against the Synousiasts or Apollinarists, some excerpts have been saved by Leontius of Byzantium[5]

3. HIS DOCTRINE. — During the Christological controversies of the fifth and sixth centuries, Diodorus acquired an unenviable notoriety. While living he was esteemed a pillar of orthodoxy, but after his death was himself accused of heresey. There is no doubt that his teachings contain the germs of those errors that his disciple Theodore was one day to nourish and develop until they became that Nestorianism which the Church rejected. In his efforts to defend against the Arians the true divinity and against the Apollinarists the true humanity of Christ, he so weakened the union of the divine and the human in Our Lord, that it became a mere indwelling, *ἐνοίκησις*, of the Logos in a man (as in a temple or in a garment). While his actual opinions cannot now be stated with certainty, it remains true that he taught the existence of a double hypostasis in Christ; he must not, however, be accused of formal heresy. As early as 438 Cyril of Alexandria wrote three books (of which some fragments are extant) against Theodore of Mopsuestia and Diodorus of Tarsus whom he accused of being the originators of the teaching of Nestorius. Leontius of Byzantium makes Diodorus the founder and father of the depravity and impiety of Theodore of Mopsuestia[6]. Photius remarks that in his discussion of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit, *περὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος διάφορα ἐπιχειρήματα*, Diodorus bewrays already the

[1] *Suidas*, l. c. [2] L. c. [3] Bibl. Cod. 223. [4] Ib. 85.
[5] Adv. Nest. et Eut., iii. 43. [6] Ib., iii. 9.

taint of Nestorianism[1]. Photius must err, however, when he says[2] that Diodorus was anathematized by the Fifth General Council in 553.

4. LITERATURE ON DIODORUS. — The exegetical fragments of Diodorus are found in *Migne,* PG., xxxiii: Fragmenta in Genesim (1561—1580), in Exodum (1579—1586), in Deuteronomium (1585—1586), in librum Iudicum (1587—1588), in Regum primum (1587—1588), all taken from the Catena of Nicephorus on the Octateuch and the Books of Kings, Leipzig, 1772—1773; finally Fragmenta in Psalmos li—lxxiv lxxi—xcv (*Migne,* l. c. 1587—1628), from *Mai,* Nova Patrum Bibl., vi 2, 240—258, and from the Catena on the Psalms, published by *B. Corderius,* Antwerp, 1643 to 1646. 23 Latin scholia to Exodus which are, however, both insignificant and of doubtful authenticity, were overlooked by *Pitra,* Spicilegium Solesmense, Paris, 1852, i. 269—275. Nevertheless, the fragments in *Migne* are much in need of criticism. For the treatise τίς διαφορὰ θεωρίας καὶ ἀλληγορίας see *H. Kihn,* Über θεωρία und ἀλληγορία nach den verlorenen hermeneutischen Schriften der Antiochener, in Theol. Quartalschrift (1880), lxii. 531—582. For dogmatic fragments of Diodorus in Syriac see *P. de Lagarde,* Analecta Syriaca, Leipzig and London, 1858, pp. 91—100. It is to be regretted that de Lagarde was never able to carry out his promise (l. c., p. xix) to execute a complete edition of all the fragments of the writings of Diodorus. Cf. *Harnack,* Diodor von Tarsus. Vier pseudojustinische Schriften als Eigentum Diodors nachgewiesen, in Texte und Untersuchungen, new series, Leipzig. 1901, vi. 69—230, with a German translation of nearly all the four Pseudo-Justin writings that he ascribes to Diodorus; *F. X. Funk,* Le pseudo-Justin et Diodore de Tarse, in Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique (1902), iii. 947—971 (rejects Harnack's thesis of the authorship of Diodorus).

5. FLAVIAN OF ANTIOCH. — Flavian (see no. 1), who was made in 381 Patriarch of Antioch, died in 404. He left some writings that are now known to us only by occasional mention in later works. Theodoret of Cyrus quotes from his homilies (Dial. i. 66, ed. *Schulze;* ii. 160; iii. 250 f.) and mentions a commentary on the Gospel of Luke (ib., ii. 160) and perhaps (i. 46) a commentary on the Gospel of John. For other quotations that might be easily multiplied, cf. *E. Venables,* in *Smith* and *Wace,* A Dict. of Christian Biography, ii. 531.

### § 73. Theodore of Mopsuestia.

1. HIS LIFE. — Theodore, whom we have frequently mentioned as a disciple of Diodorus, was also born at Antioch, about 350, of rich and noble parents. He studied rhetoric and literature under the famous sophist Libanius; among his fellow disciples was the somewhat older John, known to later ages as Chrysostomus. It was the ambition of Theodore to become a lawyer and in that way to acquire both honors and wealth. But the example and the advice of his friend induced him, before his twentieth year, to retire to the monastery of Diodorus and Carterius. Here he magnanimously gave up all worldly attractions and pleasures, and turned with earnestness to a life of ascetism and the study of the Scriptures. Soon, however, his zeal relaxed. He abandoned his solitude for the noisy clamor

[1] Bibl. Cod. 102. [2] Ib. 18.

of the forum, and also wished to exchange his monastic vows for the married state. It was only the eloquent letter of St. Chrysostom that induced him to abandon this purpose and return to his monastery[1]. About 383 he was ordained priest by Flavian, bishop of Antioch, and for the next ten years was occupied in his native city as a worker in the pastoral ministry and a learned writer. He had long been known as a vigorous defender of the doctrines of the Church against the current heresies when, about 392, he was consecrated bishop of Mopsuestia in Cilicia. Here, as far as we can learn from the extant sources of information, he took an active part in all the movements and events that make up the contemporary history of the Church in the East. Chrysostom himself tells us that the bishop of Mopsuestia was a staunch defender of the friend of his youth[2] He died about 428 after a pastoral activity of 36 years, as Theodoret expressly states[3].

2. HIS EXEGETICAL WRITINGS. HERMENEUTIC PRINCIPLES. LIMITATION OF CANON. — Theodore was scarcely twenty years of age when he had composed a commentary on the Psalms. There are still extant in manuscript Syriac and Latin epitomes of this commentary; not a few large fragments of the Greek text have also reached us. In this work he set himself to illustrate with all possible precision the grammatico-historical method of scriptural interpretation; all allegorizing was sternly put aside, and the titles of the Psalms declared posterior additions. He held to the Davidic authorship of all the Psalms, but admitted only four as directly Messianic in their import (Ps. 2 8 45 110, Septuagint text); nineteen referred to David and his time, one to Jeremias, twenty-five to the Assyrian and sixty-seven to the Chaldaic period, seventeen to the age of the Maccabees; for seventeen others he was unable to furnish an historical exposition, and looked on them as didactic poems. Such a treatment of the Psalms was calculated to call forth sharp remonstrances and lively hostility. In later writings he explicitly retracted some of his views, yet not so as to satisfy the necessary demands of the Church in matters of faith. In 553 the Fifth General Council[4] rejected his indirect (typical) exposition of Psalms 16 22 69 (Septuagint text); it was taken, however, not from his Psalm-commentary but from a (lost) dedicatory letter prefixed to his commentary on the twelve minor prophets. In the Psalm-commentary he had not recognized in the last mentioned Psalms even a typical reference to

[1] Cf. the two books or letters of St. Chrysostom Ad Theodorum lapsum (§ 74, 8), and the reply of Theodore (*Migne,* PG., xlviii. 1063—1066; the authenticity of this reply is doubted.

[2] Ep. 112; cf *Facundus Herm.,* Pro defens. trium. capitum, vii. 7.

[3] Hist. eccl., v. 39.

[4] Coll. iv, n. 21—24: *Mansi,* SS. Conc. Coll., ix. 211—213.

the Messiah. This commentary on the twelve minor prophets dedicated to a certain Tyrius (Martyrius?) is the only one of the writings of Theodore (the dedication excepted) that has reached us in the original text, probably because it gave less offence than his other writings. The Fifth General Council anathematized[1] his exposition and criticism of Job and the Canticle of canticles, also his theory on the authority of Proverbs and Ecclesiastes (according to others of Ecclesiasticus). The book of Job, he declared, was the work of an ambitious Jew, desirous of imitating the dramas of the pagan poets; the Canticle of canticles was an epithalamium composed on the occasion of Solomon's wedding with an Egyptian princess. He denied that the author of Proverbs and Ecclesiastes possessed the gift of prophecy, and recognized in them only a lower degree of inspiration. Leontius of Byzantium asserts[2] that Theodore refused to accept as canonical not only Job, the Canticle of canticles and the Psalm-titles, but also the third and fourth Books of Kings, with Esdras and Nehemias; he also excluded from the Canon of the New Testament the Epistle of St. James and «the subsequent Catholic epistles of other writers». He wrote commentaries after the example of Diodorus on the entire Scripture[3]: *τὴν ὅλην γραφὴν ὑπεμνημάτισαν*. Indeed, there are still extant under his name fragments of commentaries on the whole New Testament. The commentary on the shorter epistles of St. Paul (Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, First and Second toThessalonians, First and Second to Timothy, Philemon) has reached us in its entirety, not, however, in the original Greek, but in a Latin version, probably made in Africa about the middle of the sixth century. His commentary on the Gospel of St. John is extant in Syriac. As early as the fifth century the writings of Theodore were translated into Syriac; since then they have always been highly esteemed by the Nestorians of Syria. During the sixth and seventh centuries their synods anathematized all those who dared in any way to differ from the scriptural interpretations of «The Exegete», an honorable title that still clings *κατ' ἐξοχήν* to his name in the Nestorian communities.

3. OTHER WRITINGS. CHRISTOLOGY. DOCTRINE ON GRACE. — Theodore wrote many other works, and among them several of a dogmatico-polemical character. We still possess from the hand of the Nestorian metropolitan Ebedjesu († 1318) a list which contains besides the exegetical works, those writings of Theodore acknowledged as genuine by Syrian Nestorians. They are the following: a Book on the mysteries, one on the faith (very probably the *symbolum*[4], a book on the priesthood, two on the Holy Spirit, one on the Incarnation *(περὶ*

[1] Coll. iv, n. 63—71: *Mansi,* l. c., ix. 223—227.
[2] Adv. Nest. et Eut., iii. 12—17. [3] *Leont.*, De sectis, iv. 3.
[4] *Migne,* PG., lxvi. 1015—1020.

*τῆς ἐνανθρωπήσεως)*[1], two against Eunomius *(κατ' Εὐνομίου)*[2], two against those who maintained that sin is a part of our nature[3] *(πρὸς τοὺς λέγοντας φύσει, καὶ οὐ γνώμῃ, πταίειν τοὺς ἀνθρώπους)*, two against magic, one to the monks, one on the obscure language (of Scripture?), one on the perfection of works, five books against the Allegorists (very probably the book *De allegoria et historia contra Originem*[4], one in favor of Basil *(ὑπὲρ Βασιλείου κατὰ Εὐνομίου)*[5] perhaps identical with the two books against Eunomius already mentioned, one *De assumente et assumpto* (very probably the work against Apollinaris often referred to elsewhere), a «book of pearls» i. e. a collection of letters of Theodore[6], and a treatise on legislation[7] We possess at present only isolated fragments of these works but enough, however, to make it certain that Theodore was a Nestorius before Nestorius. Like Diodorus he taught that in Christ there were two persons *(δύο ὑποστάσεις)*. The divine nature is a person, and the human nature is a person. The unity of the two natures *(συνάφεια)* consists in the community of thought and will. The Christian adores one sole Lord because the man who was joined to the Logos in a moral union was raised, in reward of his perseverance, to a divine dignity *(χωρίζω τὰς φύσεις, ἑνῶ τὴν προσκύνησιν)*. But the properties and the activity (as well as the suffering of the humanity) of both natures are to be carefully kept apart. Only the man was born and died. It is absurd and blasphemous to say that God suffered, trembled, shuddered. Mary cannot, therefore, be called the Mother of God, or, if so, only in an improper sense. In its eighth and last session, the Fifth General Council condemned Theodore and his impious writings, and in its anathematisms also individually many Christological theses of Theodore. Theodore also met with contradiction for his anthropological doctrine and his teaching concerning grace. Marius Mercator is unjust towards Theodore when he accuses him[8] of being the father of Pelagianism. Nevertheless, the doctrine of Theodore substantially is Pelagian; for he denies original sin, as may be seen from his work against the defenders of that doctrine, excerpts from which can be read in Marius Mercator and Photius.

4. EDITIONS OF HIS WRITINGS. — The *Migne* edition of Theodore of Mopsuestia (PG., lxvi, Paris, 1859—1864) includes the following: Commentarius in xii prophetas minores (105—632), and Fragmenta in Genesim (633—646), in Exodum (647—648), in Psalmos (647—696), in Jobum (697—698), in Canticum canticorum (699—700); Commentarii in Novum Testamentum i. e. Fragmenta in Matth. (703—714), Marc. (713—716), Luc. (715—728), Io. (727—786), Acta (785—786), Ep. ad Rom. (787—876),

[1] *Cyrill. Alex.*, Ep. 70. [2] *Phot.*, Bibl. Cod. 177. [3] Ib.
[4] *Facundus Herm.*, Pro defens. trium capit., iii. 6. [5] *Phot.*, Bibl. Cod. 4.
[6] Ib., Cod. 177.
[7] The catalogue is in *J. S. Assemani*, Bibl. Orient., iii 1, 33—35.
[8] Comm. adv. haeresim Pelagii, praef.; Refut. symboli Theod. Mops., praef., n. 2.

1 Cor. (877—894), 2 Cor. (893—898), Gal. (897—912), Eph. (911—922), Phil. (921—926), Col. (925—932), 1 Thess. (931—934), 2 Thess. (933—936), 1 Tim. (935—944), 2 Tim. (945—948), Tit. (947—950), Philem. (949—950), Hebr. (951—968); finally Fragmenta dogmatica (969—1020). — Since Migne's time the number of fragments has considerably increased. For unedited Syriac excerpts from the Psalm-commentary cf. *Fr Baethgen,* in Zeitschrift f. die alttestamentl. Wissenschaft (1885), v. 53—101. New Greek fragments on seventeen Psalms taken from the Psalm-catena of *B. Corderius,* Antwerp, 1643—1646, may be seen in *Baethgen,* l. c. (1886), vi. 261—288; (1887), vii. 1—60. For a Latin translation of the Psalm-commentary and other Greek fragments in manuscripts of the Ambrosian library at Milan see *G. Mercati,* Un palimpsesto Ambrosiano dei Salmi Esapli, Turin, 1896; Alcune note di letteratura patristica, Milan, 1898. This Latin version was edited (in large part) by *G. Ascoli* from the Codice Irlandese dell' Ambrosiana, in Archivio glottologico italiano, v.) See also *H. Leitzmann,* Der Psalmenkommentar Theodors von Mopsuestia, in Sitzungsberichte der kgl. preuss. Akad. der Wissensch. zu Berlin, 1902, pp. 334—346. This scholar discovered the original Greek of the commentary on Psalms 32—60. The Latin version of the commentary on the shorter epistles of St. Paul was first published, but with many gaps, by *Pitra* (Spicilegium Solesmense, Paris, 1852, i. 49—159), who also erroneously attributed it to Hilary of Poitiers. This edition was reproduced with additional Greek fragments and various corrections by *H. B. Swete,* Cambridge, 1880—1882, 2 vols., who also reprinted in an appendix (ii. 289—339) the Fragmenta dogmatica. *J. B. Chabot* edited (Paris, 1897) the Syriac version of the Commentary on the Gospel of St. John; he also promised a Latin version of the same. Exegetical and dogmatical fragments in Syriac and Latin were published by *E. Sachau* (Leipzig, 1869), especially Fragmenta commentarii in Genesim, and Fragmenta libri de incarnatione. In the American Journal of Theology (1898), ii. 353—387, *E. v. Dobschütz* published the Greek prologue of a Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles that is probably the work of Theodore.

5. WORKS ON THEODORE. — *O. Fr. Fritzsche,* De Theodori Mopsuesteni vita et scriptis commentatio historica theologica, Halle 1836 (*Migne,* PG., lxvi. 9—78). *Fr A. Specht,* Der exegetische Standpunkt des Theodor von Mopsuestia und Theodoret von Kyros in der Auslegung messianischer Weissagungen aus ihren Kommentaren zu den kleinen Propheten dargestellt, Munich, 1871. *H. Kihn,* Theodor von Mopsuestia und Junilius Afrikanus als Exegeten, Freiburg, 1880. *H. B. Swete,* Theodorus of Mopsuestia, in Dictionary of Christian Biography (1887), iv. 934 to 948. *Th. Zahn,* Das Neue Testament Theodors von Mopsuestia, in Neue kirchl. Zeitschr. (1900), xi. 788—806. See also *W. Wright,* Syriac Literature, London, 1894. *R. Duval,* La littérature syriaque, Paris, 1899.

6. POLYCHRONIUS. — Theodoret ends his notice on Theodore of Mopsuestia (Hist. eccl., v. 39) with the words: «His brother Polychronius was an excellent pastor (ἐποίμαινεν) of the church of Apamea and was distinguished for the charm of his discourse as well as for the splendor of his virtuous life.» Apamea, without any qualification, is the well-known city in Syria, and the word ποιμαίνειν indicates, of course, the office and dignity of a bishop, while the imperfect tense ἐποίμαινεν must mean that, when Theodoret wrote (about 428), Polychronius was still alive, in other words, was bishop of Apamea. Polychronius was a very prolific writer, and, like his brother, principally in the field of exegesis. Up to the present, only scattered Scholia, from the Catenae, have reached us under his name,

particularly some on the Book of Job (edited principally by *P. Junius,* Catena Graecorum Patrum in beatum Job, London, 1637), on the Book of Daniel (by *Mai,* Scriptorum vet. nova coll., Rome, 1825, part 2, i. 105—160), and on Ezechiel (by *Mai,* Nova Patr. Bibl., 1854, part 2, vii. 92—127). The Scholia on Daniel and Ezechiel are in *Migne,* PG., clxii. In as far as can be judged from these fragments, Polychronius must be ranked among the greatest exegetes of Antioch and of Greek antiquity in general, though his exposition bewrays throughout a rationalizing tendency that vividly recalls his brother Theodore. Only little light is thrown upon his doctrinal views by the extant fragments, which, however in no way, justify the not unnatural suspicion of Nestorianism. See *O. Bardenhewer,* Polychronius, Bruder Theodors von Mopsuestia und Bischof von Apamea, Freiburg, 1879.

## § 74. St. John Chrysostom.

1. HIS LIFE BEFORE HIS ORDINATION TO THE PRIESTHOOD. — John, surnamed Chrysostom (Golden Mouth), was born at Antioch, probably in 344, though the date of 347 is possible. He was brought up amid surroundings of splendor and wealth[1], but lost his father Secundus while still an infant[2]; his education was cared for by his pious mother Anthusa. He sought and found a more advanced training from the philosopher Andragathius and especially the rhetorician Libanius, the famous apologist of decadent heathenism. His inseparable friend was a certain Basil. «We pursued the same sciences», he writes himself[3], «and listened also to the same teachers. Our devotion and our enthusiasm for the studies that we followed were the same, our aspirations were alike and they arose from the same motives. For this concord of sentiments was made plain not only while we were at school, but even after we had left it and gone forth to decide on our future career.» His own inclination and the example of his friend moved Chrysostom to renounce both theatre and forum, and to devote himself in retirement to prayer and the study of the Scriptures. He made a profound study of Christian doctrine under the guidance of Meletius, patriarch of Antioch, by whom he was baptized about 369, it being customary at that time to put off baptism to a mature age. He had also for masters Diodorus, afterwards bishop of Tarsus, and Carterius. It was his purpose to quit the paternal roof and take refuge in the desert with his friend Basil, but he yielded, however, to the prayers of his mother, who begged him not to make her again a widow. Nevertheless, he withdrew completely from the world and led a life of strict mortification[4]. It must have been about 373 that by reason of their virtues the two friends were selected for the episcopal office. Basil yielded, but only, as he believed at least, after securing from Chrysostom the promise that he too would accept the same burden — this Basil is generally identified with Basil of Raphaneia, who assisted

[1] De sacerdotio, ii. 8. [2] Ib., i. 5; cf. Ad viduam iun., c. 2.
[3] De sacerdotio, i. 1. [4] Ib., i. 4—6.

at the Council of Constantinople (in 381) and whose name appears among those of the last Syrian bishops to sign its decrees[1]; but Chrysostom, filled with distrust of himself, took refuge in flight. His six splendid books on the priesthood (see no. 8) were written to justify himself in the eyes of the friend whom he had so grievously deceived. His own desire was to free himself from all worldly cares and to withdraw to the desert. After the death of his mother, apparently, he retired to the mountainous region near Antioch where he spent four years under the guidance of an aged monk, and, afterwards passed two years in a cave, in the practice of ascetic exercises and the study of the Book of Books[2]. His delicate and weakly body was, however, unequal to this strain, and he was forced by sickness to return to Antioch.

2. CHRYSOSTOM AS PREACHER AT ANTIOCH. — In 381 Chrysostom was ordained deacon by Meletius, and early in the year 386 he was raised to the priesthood by Flavian, the successor of Meletius. Flavian entertained for him a special affection, kept him constantly at his side, and soon entrusted to him the duty of preaching in the principal church of the city. For more than ten years Chrysostom discharged this office with ardent zeal and great success. The most famous of his homilies were delivered between 387 and 397 Antioch heard his discourses with enthusiasm and admiration, and the fame of the illustrious preacher spread far and wide.

3. CHRYSOSTOM, PATRIARCH OF CONSTANTINOPLE. CHRYSOSTOM AND EUTROPIUS. — Nectarius, patriarch of Constantinople, died September 27., 397 At the suggestion of the emperor Arcadius, Chrysostom was chosen by the clergy and people as successor to Nectarius. It was only by cunning and violence that the newly-elected bishop was brought from Antioch to the capital. Theophilus, patriarch of Alexandria, raised some futile objections against the election; he was compelled himself to consecrate Chrysostom, February 26., 398. From that day Chrysostom considered it his sacred duty to preach to the people the word of God. At the same time he began a war of extermination against the abuses that had crept in among the clergy of the city and the patriarchate. In the beginning he was aided by the imperial court, but ere long could recognize the growth of a strong opposition. The weak and narrow-minded emperor, always at the mercy of his advisers, was entirely in the hands of the eunuch Eutropius who abused his great influence to satisfy his insatiable avarice. Chrysostom alone dared to oppose the all-powerful favorite. His warnings were heard with contemptuous unconcern, but his threats of divine vengeance had not to wait long for their fulfilment. The accounts of the fall of Eutropius vary con-

[1] *Mansi,* SS. Conc. Coll., iii. 568.

[2] *Pallad.,* Dial. de vita S. Ioan. Chrys., c. 5.

siderably. In the beginning of 399, the favorite escaped death only by a hasty flight to the church where he claimed the right of asylum, the same privilege that shortly before he had violated because it stood between him and his own victims. His fate was already sealed, had not Chrysostom interfered and, for the sake of the guilty wretch, defended a privilege held sacred from time immemorial.

4. CHRYSOSTOM AND EUDOXIA. — After the fall of Eutropius, the imperial authority passed rapidly into the hands of the empress Eudoxia, with the result that soon there broke out a still graver conflict between the court and the patriarch. Very probably this new rupture was the work of some high-placed ecclesiastics who left no opportunity untried of prejudicing the empress against Chrysostom. Early in 401, Chrysostom wrote to John archbishop of Cæsarea, and to Porphyry bishop of Gaza that he was unable to further their suits with the emperor, since all his relations with the court were broken off by the anger of the empress, on account of his grave remonstrances against the empress by reason of her unjust seizure of other people's property[1]. A still greater tension arose during the next year between the two patriarchs Chrysostom and Theophilus, when the former welcomed, with reserve indeed, but still with much charity, the Nitrian monks whom the latter had driven from their native land and continued virulently to pursue even outside of Egypt. For a while, it is true, the affair of the Nitrian monks threatened unpleasant and even dangerous consequences not to Chrysostom but to Theophilus who was called to Constantinople to give an account of his proceedings before a synod presided over by Chrysostom, but the order was not enforced, and soon the conditions were reversed. It has already been made clear (§ 71, 1) how Theophilus was able to turn to good account the interest of Chrysostom in the Origenist monks, so that he roused against Chrysostom the intemperate zeal of Epiphanius. Hardly had the latter quitted the capital, when Chrysostom delivered a discourse (unfortunately lost) against the luxury of women and their inordinate love of ornaments. It was at once interpreted as an insidious attack on the weak point in the character of the empress who lost no time in urging Theophilus to come at once to the capital and to hold a synod there for the purpose of deposing Chrysostom. Theophilus arrived at Chalcedon early in August, 403, with some twenty-five Egyptian suffragans, blindly subservient to the wishes of their metropolitan, and he was joined by some suffragans of Constantinople, for one reason or another inimical to their patriarch. In this way thirty-six bishops met, at a villa near Chalcedon, known as «The Oak», whence their synod has been called the «Synod of the Oak» (*σύνοδος ἐπὶ δρῦν*, ad quercum).

[1] *Marcus Diaconus,* Vita S. Porphyrii episc. Gaz., c. 37.

The affair of the Egyptian monks was utterly ignored, and a long series of charges trumped up against Chrysostom, charges that Photius declares do not deserve to be mentioned[1]. Though Chrysostom had gathered about him in a synod of his own some forty bishops, he agreed to appear before the synod of «The Oak», on condition that four bishops, his declared enemies, were excluded from the number of his judges — first and foremost, Theophilus. Because of his non-appearance the *conciliabulum* declared him deposed from the see of Constantinople, and referred to the emperor the charge of high treason, as being beyond its jurisdiction. According to the statement of Palladius[2] this charge consisted in the designation by Chrysostom of the empress as a Jezabel[3] Though no evidence was offered by the accusers of the patriarch, the emperor confirmed the decree of the synod and condemned Chrysostom to banishment. Thereupon a feverish agitation spread among the people of the capital to whom their spiritual shepherd was an object of profound love and veneration. Chrysostom undertook to pacify the multitude by a splendid discourse on the invincibility of the Church and the inseparable union of the head and members[4]; on the third day after his condemnation he placed himself at the disposal of the civil authority and was led into exile. The excitement assumed threatening dimensions. In the following night the capital was shaken by a violent earthquake, whereupon Eudoxia was seized with such fear and anguish that she requested from the emperor the immediate recall of Chrysostom. She also wrote to the patriarch a letter of regret in which she asserted her innocence of the wrong done him and called on God to witness her tears[5] The imperial messengers came up with the exile near Prenetum in Bithynia. When he reached again the shores of the Bosphorus, an indescribable joy filled the hearts of the whole population. But Chrysostom still hesitated to enter the city and resume his episcopal functions on account of the fourth and twelfth canons of the Council of Antioch (341), according to which a bishop deposed in one synod could not re-enter his see, unless he were re-instated by a larger synod, violators of these canons were to be for ever dispossessed of their sees[6]. He desired, therefore, a greater synod to take cognizance of what was done, and to examine the charges of the synod of «the Oak» against him, but the popular impatience was irresistible. With loving violence, Chrysostom was again inducted into his see, the return journey was turned into a triumphant procession; the empress herself made haste to assure him of her joy at the fulfilment of her prayers and earnest wishes[7]. The following day

[1] Bibl. Cod. 59. [2] Dial. de vita S. Ioan. Chrys., c. 8. [3] Apoc. ii. 20.
[4] *Migne*, PG., lii. 427*—430. [5] *Chrys.*, Hom. post reditum, n. 4.
[6] *Mansi*, SS. Conc. Coll., ii. 1309 1313.
[7] *Chrys.*, Hom. post reditum, n. 4.

Chrysostom entered the pulpit of his cathedral and spoke of the empress in terms of the highest praise[1]

5. PROGRESS AND END OF THE CHRYSOSTOM-TRAGEDY. — This peaceful condition of affairs was not destined to last. Some two months after these events, during the autumn of 403, a statue of the empress was erected in the capital quite close to the cathedral church. At its dedication there were the usual ceremonies lasting several days, with games, dances and other amusements. The popular dissipation was unquestionably excessive, and went so far as to disturb the ecclesiastical services. Chrysostom requested the city-prefect to put an end to these disturbances in the vicinity of the church. Thereupon the prefect reported to the empress that the patriarch objected to the honors paid her statue by the people. Wounded in her vanity, the empress resolved to rid herself of the intrepid disciplinarian, and applied anew to Theophilus. Socrates[2] and Sozomen[3] relate that, when Chrysostom heard of her extreme resolution, he too proceeded to extremes, and, on the feast of the Beheading of St. John the Baptist, began his sermon with the following words: «Again doth Herodias rave, again doth she rage, again doth she dance (?), again doth she ask for the head of John (the speaker also was John!) on a trencher.» The correctness of the statement is open to grave suspicions, ostensibly the words are to be found in the above-mentioned *Hom. in decoll. S. Ioan. Bapt.*[4] that really does open with these words, but is not, however, a homily of Chrysostom; on the contrary, it was probably forged by his enemies for the persual of the empress. In the meantime the plan of Eudoxia ripened. Theophilus, however, could not resolve on another visit to the capital, but through his envoys caused the aforesaid canons of Antioch to be invoked against Chrysostom. The legitimacy and validity of these canons, it is true, was not universally admitted, but even if it were granted, they had no reference to Chrysostom in the eyes of those who denied the legality of the sentence passed by the «Synod of the Oak» In the East, however, all justice was, in those days, trampled on by the will of the emperor or the empress. The tragedy of Chrysostom, as Isidore of Pelusium remarks[5], furnishes the most disgraceful proof of the fact that it was Christian bishops who constantly made broader and easier the way of imperial absolutism and cæsaropapism. The emperor ordered Chrysostom to cease performing ecclesiastical functions which he refused to do, whereupon he was forbidden to quit his residence. On Holy Saturday, 404, he entered the Cathedral in order to baptize with his own hand the catechumens whom he had instructed in the preceding year. The ceremonies were interrupted at nightfall by armed

[1] Ib., n. 3 4. [2] Hist. eccl., vi. 18. [3] Hist. eccl., viii. 20.
[4] *Migne*, PG., lix. 485—490. [5] Ep. i. 152.

soldiers, the faithful driven with violence from the church; even the baptismal water was stained with blood, and the Holy Eucharist profaned. When an attempt was made to gather the faithful in another place where the sacred function might be completed, fresh violence and greater cruelties were committed. A few days after Pentecost (404) the emperor, yielding to the insistence of the patriarch's enemies, gave him strict orders to leave the city at once. In order to avoid a popular sedition, Chrysostom placed himself (June 20.) secretly in the hands of those who were appointed to take him to his place of exile. He learned at Nicæa, where they stayed a few days, that his destination was Cucusus in Lesser Armenia, «the most abandoned spot in the world» *(τὸ πάσης τῆς οἰκουμένης ἐρημότατον χωρίον)* [1]. As the party wound its way inland, the surroundings grew more inhospitable, the trials greater, and the privations more numerous. His «weak and spiderlike» body [2] was worn out by fever and ailments of the stomach. From the bishops of the cities through which he passed, he received a treatment that caused him afterward to write: «with exception of a few, it is the bishops whom I fear most» [3]. At the end of seventy days he reached Cucusus, where he was welcomed with affection and attentively cared for. In the meantime another persecution had begun at Constantinople. Its victims were the friends and adherents of John, called Johannites, and its violence recalled the days of Nero and Domitian; it spread quickly through the neighboring provinces and finally to every part of the empire. The Johannites were made to bear the blame of a conflagration which had broken out immediately after his exile, and by which the cathedral (Sancta Sophia) with the adjoining edifices (among them the splendid palace of the Senate) had been destroyed. As a judicial investigation led to no result, the origin of that fire has always remained unknown. Chrysostom was at once succeeded by Arsacius, a brother of the preceding patriarch Nectarius; when Arsacius died, Nov. 11. 405, he was followed by Atticus. But the great majority of the Johannites, in spite of manifold violence, refused to recognize either Arsacius or Atticus, and conducted their church services apart. Extraordinary natural phenomena, in which the hand of God seemed visible, strengthened the Johannites in their resistance. Eudoxia had triumphed over her adversary, but she sickened and died, a few months afterwards, in the flower of her age. Pope Innocent I., to whom both parties had appealed, sided with Chrysostom, but did not break off communion with Theophilus. The ecumenical council proposed by the pope never met, and the mediation of the western emperor Honorius, proffered at the request of the pope, was rejected with much contumely by

[1] *Chrys.*, Ep. 234; cf. 194 235.
[2] *Chrys.*, Ep. 4 ad Olymp., n. 4.
[3] Ep. 14 ad Olymp., n. 4.

Arcadius or his counsellors. The entire West broke off communion with Atticus. The conflict with the patriarch and the empress had now become a schism between the East and the West. During these proceedings a period of tribulation had opened for Chrysostom. At Cucusus he suffered equally from the cold of winter and the heat of summer; the raids of Isaurian marauders caused the entire population of the wretched place to wander about constantly in ravines and forests. But no suffering could bend Chrysostom, he remained constantly in close touch with his flock in the capital and with his friends in the less distant Antioch by means of frequent visits and an extensive correspondence. His tireless zeal found a new object in the mission-stations that he was enabled to establish among the Goths in Cilicia and Phoenicia. On the other hand, his enemies were not inactive. Palladius tells us, in his dialogue on the life of Chrysostom[1], that they could not tolerate «the sight of the entire Antiochene community going in pilgrimage towards Armenia, whence in turn resounded through the church of Antioch the echoes of the sweet philosophy of Chrysostom». At their petition Arcadius ordered Chrysostom to leave Cucusus and to go to Pityus, a wild spot near the eastern extremity of the Black Sea. It was probably towards the end of June, 407, that Chrysostom began the journey to Pityus; on Sept. 14., he yielded up his spirit at Comana in Pontus, broken by the hardships of the way. His last words were his habitual expression or motto: «Glory be to God for all *(δόξα τῷ θεῷ πάντων ἕνεκεν)*, and a last Amen[2]. — Atticus and his friends were received into the communion of Rome only on condition that they should recite in the diptychs the name of the deceased patriarch. It is said that the last of the Johannites were reconciled only when, in the beginning of the year 438, the earthly remains of the Saint were brought back to Constantinople and interred in the Church of the Apostles. Theodoret[3] tells us that the emperor Theodosius II., a son of Eudoxia, went out to meet the funeral train, and bending low over the body of the martyr «begged that he would intercede with God for his parents who had sinned through ignorance».

6. EXEGETICAL HOMILIES. — No other writer of the Greek Church has left so extensive a literary legacy as Chrysostom. Most of his genuine and undoubted writings are scriptural expositions in the form of homilies. First in the series are 67 homilies on Genesis[4] delivered at Antioch, probably in 388. They take up the book by sections, and exhibit, though in homily-form, a complete commentary on the text. Then follow *Homiliae 9 in Genesin*[5] all of which, excepting the last, deal with the first three chapters of the book. Some chapters of the Books of Kings are commented on in

[1] Dial., c. 11. [2] Ib. [3] Hist. eccl., v. 36.
[4] *Migne,* PG., liii—liv; cf. lxiv. 499—502. [5] Ib., liv. 581—630.

his *Homiliae 5 de Anna*[1], preached at Easter 387, and *Homiliae 3 de Davide et Saule*[2], delivered in the summer of 387; we have not from his pen a continuous commentary on Kings. He seems to have explained all the Psalms in a long series of homilies; we possess so far only his exposition of about 60 Psalms (4—12 43—49 108 to 117 119—150)[3] It remains uncertain whether he wrote on any other poetical books of the Old Testament; there are important fragments of a commentary on Job[4] and on Proverbs[5] that bear his name, but to establish their genuineness will require more study and better proof. On the prophetic books we have the two homilies *De prophetiarum obscuritate*[6], composed at Antioch about 386. The commentary on the beginning of Isaias (i. 1 to viii. 10)[7] is probably an excerpt from homilies (of the year 387?) which the compiler stripped of their oratorical garb and worked into a continuous explanation of the text. Besides this commentary on Isaias there are six other homilies[8], delivered in 386. Many scholia on Jeremias bear the name of Chrysostom[9]; and the so-called commentary on Daniel[10] is only a compilation of scholia from the Catenæ. — His exposition of the New Testament begins with 90 homilies on Matthew[11]. They were written and delivered at Antioch about 390, and exhibit him not only as a great preacher but as a great expounder of Scripture. Suidas speaks[12] of commentaries of St. Chrysostom «on Matthew and Mark and Luke»; but this is probably an error, for there is no other mention of commentaries on Mark and Luke. The nearest approach to one is the series of *Homiliae 7 de Lazaro*[13], and the single homily on this same parable[14] But on the other hand, we possess the commentary on the Gospel of John, also mentioned by Suidas[15]; its 88 homilies are much shorter than those on Matthew, and were delivered at Antioch, probably about 389. About 400 or 401 Chrysostom illustrated the text of the Acts of the Apostles in 55 homilies[16]; their language is less polished than that of other discourses of Chrysostom, probably because they have reached us only in an uncorrected tachygraphic report. The four homilies on the beginning of the Acts of the Apostles[17], and the four on the change of name in the case of St. Paul and other biblical personages[18], were delivered during the Eastertide of 388. Chrysostom wrote and delivered homilies on all the Epistles of St. Paul: 32 on the Epistle to the Romans in 391[19]; 44 and 30, respectively,

[1] *Migne*, PG., liv. 631—676. [2] Ib., liv. 675—708. [3] Ib., lv.
[4] Ib., lxiv. 503—656. [5] Ib., lxiv. 659—740. [6] Ib., lvi. 163—192.
[7] Ib., lvi. 11—94. [8] Ib., lvi. 97—142. [9] Ib., lxiv. 739—1038.
[10] Ib., lvi. 193—246. [11] Ib., lvii. lviii. [12] Lex. s. v. Ioan. Antioch.
[13] Lk. xvi. 19—31; *Migne*, PG., xlviii. 963—1054. [14] *Migne*, lxiv. 433—444.
[15] Ib., lix; the episode of the adulterous woman, John vii. 53 to viii. 11 is wanting.
[16] Ib., lx. [17] Ib., li. 65—112. [18] Ib., li. 113—156.
[19] Ib., lx; cf. the supplement lxiv. 1037.

about 392, on the two Epistles to the Corinthians[1]; and 3 homilies on marriage in explanation of 1 Cor. vii. 1 ff.[2], and three others on 2 Cor. iv 13[3]; a commentary on Galatians[4], which must have been originally in homily-form, like the exposition of Isaias mentioned above; also 24 on Ephesians, 15 on Philippians, 12 on Colossians, 11 on 1 Thessalonians, 5 on 2 Thessalonians, 18 on 1 Timothy, 10 on 2 Timothy, 6 on Titus, 3 on Philemon[5], and 34 on Hebrews[6] The last 34 homilies were not published until after the death of Chrysostom and then from the notes of the tachygraphers. Some *scholia* to the Catholic Epistles have been edited under the name of Chrysostom[7] We may add a great number of homilies, which deal, in one way or another, with isolated texts of the Scripture. — Among the expositions of the Old Testament, his homilies on the Psalms have always been held in special esteem. The best of his New Testament commentaries are, by common consent, the homilies on Romans. Isidore of Pelusium[8] said of them that «the treasures of the wisdom of the learned John are especially abundant in his exposition of the Epistle to the Romans. I think (and it cannot be said that I write to flatter any one) that if the divine Paul wished to expound in the Attic tongue his own writings, he would not have spoken otherwise than this famous master; so remarkable is the latter's exposition for its contents, its beauty of form, and propriety of expression». In later ages the judgment of the Pelusiot († ca. 440) has often been quoted with approval.

7 OTHER DISCOURSES. — Chrysostom preached, besides the exegetical homilies, many other sermons on miscellaneous subjects. Not a few, however, are of doubtful or disputed provenance. The *Homiliae 8 adversus Judaeos*[9] preached in the years 387—389, not so much against the Jews as against those Christians who followed the Jews in their feasts or their fasts, and especially against the Protopaschites (Hom. 3); the *Homiliae 12 contra Anomoeos de incomprehensibili*[10] delivered partly at Antioch and partly at Constantinople and treating of the incomprehensibility of God and the essential unity of the Son and the Father; also a *Homilia de resurrectione mortuorum*[11], are usually classed as dogmatico-polemical discourses. — His ascetico-moral homilies are more numerous. Some of them form connected groups, thus the *Catecheses 2 ad illuminandos*[12] addressed to the catechumens early in the Lent of 387; the *Homiliae 3 de diabolo tentatore*[13] concerning temptations to sin (the second of these homilies in Montfaucon and Migne should have been put in the third place);

[1] Ib., lxi. [2] Ib., li. 207—242. [3] Ib., li. 271—302. [4] Ib., lxi.
[5] Ib., lxii. [6] Ib., lxiii. [7] Ib., lxiv. 1039—1062. [8] Ep., v. 32.
[9] *Migne,* PG., xlviii. 843—942. [10] Ib., xlviii. 701— 812.
[11] Ib., l. 417[ter]—432. [12] Ib., xlix. 223—240.
[13] Ib., xlix. 241—276.

the *Homiliae 9 de poenitentia*[1] the last three of which, if not more, are of somewhat doubtful genuineness. Most of these homilies, however, are complete treatises, each one of them treating its subject exhaustively. Some of them are quite well-known in Greek homiletic literature, thus: the discourse *In Kalendas*[2], a rebuke of the superstitious excesses with which the New Year was celebrated; the discourse *De eleemosyna*[3], a detailed interpretation of 1 Cor. xvi. 1—4; the discourse *Contra circenses ludos et theatra*[4] Of his festal discourses the following have been preserved: two on Christmas[5], the first of which was preached Dec. 25., 388, while the second is of doubtful genuineness; a discourse on the Epiphany or on the Baptism of our Lord[6]; three discourses on the treason of Judas, for Holy Thursday[7]; the second discourse is only a recast of the first either by the author or by a later writer, while the third is of doubtful origin; three Good Friday discourses on the Sepulchre and on the Cross and on the Good Thief[8], the second and third of which represent probably the same sermon; two discourses on Easter[9], the second of doubtful genuineness; two discourses on the Ascension[10], the second is of doubtful origin; three discourses on Pentecost.[11] Among his panegyrics of Saints the *Homiliae 7 de laudibus S. Pauli Ap.*[12] delivered at Antioch, have always been the most admired; the old Latin translator Anianus believed that in them the great Apostle of the Gentiles was not only depicted, but in a certain sense awakened from the dead, so that he might exhibit an example of a perfect life[13]; since then it has often been said that the praises of St. Paul were never sung more nobly than by St. John Chrysostom. He delivered other panegyrics on the Saints of the Old Testament (Job, Eleazar, the Macchabees and their mother), on the martyrs in general and on several Saints of a later time, finally on Diodorus, bishop of Tarsus, and on the emperor Theodosius the Great. A special interest attaches to the discourses delivered at Antioch on the holy bishops of that city: Ignatius, Babylas, Philogonius, Eustathius and Meletius[14]. The most famous of his occasional discourses are the *Homiliae 21 de statuis ad populum Antiochenum*[15]. When Theodosius the Great imposed, early in 387, extraordinary taxes on the provinces of the East, resentment and embitterment spread

[1] *Migne*, PG., xlix. 277—350. [2] Ib., xlviii. 953—962.
[3] Ib., li. 261—272. [4] Ib., lvi. 263—270.
[5] Ib., lxix. 351—362 and lvi. 385—396. [6] Ib., xlix. 363—472.
[7] Ib., xlix. 373—392 and l. 715—720. [8] Ib., xlix. 393—418.
[9] Ib., l 433—442 and lii. 765—772. [10] Ib., l. 441—452 and lii. 773—792.
[11] Ib., l. 453—470 and lxiv. 417—424. [12] Ib., l. 473—514.
[13] Ib., l. 471*—472*
[14] The discourse on Philogonius is Hom. 6 contra Anomoeos: Ib., xlviii. 747—756; the other four: Ib. l.
[15] Ib., xlix. 15—222.

through Antioch to such a degree that among other acts of violence the statues of the emperor, his father, his sons and his deceased wife Flaccilla, were overturned, barbarously defaced and mutilated. The outraged emperor was disposed to wreak exemplary vengeance on all Antioch. An embassy, headed by Flavian, the bishop of the city, hastened at once to the capital. The discourse of Flavian to the emperor Theodosius, doubtlessly the work of Chrysostom[1], has always been accounted a model of ancient Christian eloquence. Theodosius could not restrain his tears as he listened to it. In the meantime (it was the Lenten period) Chrysostom delivered at Antioch the famous «statue-homilies»: in them he undertakes first to calm the agitated and despairing population; then he profits by the good dispositions of his audience to reprove them earnestly for the dominant vices of their city, notably the habit of frivolous swearing; finally he announces the success of the embassy and the magnanimity of the emperor. These homilies must have made the young orator master for ever of the ears and hearts of the Antiochenes. To the first years of his sojourn at Constantinople belong two other famous discourses, viz. the homilies on Eutropius[2]: in the first the orator makes plain the uncertainty of human felicity by the example of Eutropius who was visible to the audience as he clung pitifully to the altar; the second dealing with the same subject was delivered after some days, when Eutropius had left the church and fallen into the hands of justice. Other famous homilies are that on the occasion of his ordination to the priesthood, which was his first sermon[3], the one delivered on the eve of his first exile[4], and the discourse delivered on the day after his return from the exile[5].

8. APOLOGETIC AND ASCETICO-MORAL WRITINGS. — It is possible that even these writings may have been partly homiletic in their origin. Two of them are apologetic in tendency and character: the one in honor of Saint Babylas and against Julian and the heathens (*λόγος εἰς τὸν μακάριον Βαβύλαν καὶ κατὰ Ἰουλιανοῦ καὶ πρὸς Ἕλληνας*)[6] written about 382, and the demonstration of the divinity of Christ against the Jews and the heathens (*πρός τε Ἰουδαίους καὶ Ἕλληνας ἀπόδειξις ὅτι ἐστὶ θεὸς ὁ Χριστός*)[7] written perhaps in 387 In both compositions he aims at establishing the divinity of Jesus Christ; the second lays special stress on the fulfilment of the Old Testament prophecies as well as on the fulfilment of Christ's own prophecies (especially those concerning the irresistible growth of the Church and the destruction of the Temple), whereas in the first work it is the miracles of Christ and those done by Christians in his name that afford the basis of his argument. After many references to the past,

[1] Cf. Hom. 21 de statuis, n. 3. [2] *Migne,* PG., lii. 391—414.
[3] Ib., xlviii. 693—700. [4] Ib., lii. 427*—430. [5] Ib., lii. 443—448.
[6] Ib., l. 533—572. [7] Ib., xlviii. 813—838.

the author calls the present before the bar of history, and, «to confirm an already more than complete victory» (c. 4), appeals to the miracles that had taken place on the occasion of the translation of the remains of the holy bishop and martyr Babylas († 250); Julian, as the audience remembered, had ordered these remains to be taken away from the grove of Daphne near Antioch, with the intention of restoring to that site the ancient worship of Apollo and Diana. The other writings of Chrysostom are all ascetico-moral in their contents, and most of them date from the time when Chrysostom was still an anchorite; the earliest of them, in the form of epistles, are the successful exhortation «to the fallen Theodore *(λόγος παραινετικὸς εἰς Θεόδωρον ἐκπεσόντα* and *πρὸς τὸν αὐτὸν Θεόδωρον λόγος β′)*[1], his friend and companion (subsequently bishop of Mopsuestia), who had yielded to the charms of Hermione and grown weary of the ascetic life. The lively and energetic tone which marks this work, is also characteristic of his two books on penance *(περὶ κατανύξεως)*[2], written about 375 or 376 for two friends (the first addressed to Demetrius, the second to Stelechius) on the necessity of genuine penance and the nature of the same. Rauschen has shown that Chrysostom was probably only a deacon when he wrote (381—385) the three books against the enemies of monasticism *(πρὸς τοὺς πολεμοῦντας τοῖς ἐπὶ τὸ μονάζειν ἐνάγουσιν)*[3]: the first book aims at exhibiting the heinous guilt of the enemies of monasticism by a description of the sublime and holy nature of this state; the second book is addressed to a pagan father in the hope of persuading him to allow his son, already a Christian, to enter the monastic state; the third, a much more extensive, book is addressed, with the same purpose, to a Christian father. In the second book Chrysostom occasionally draws (c. 6) a parallel between a monk and a king, and the same thought is more fully developed in a little work entitled: «Comparison of the power, wealth and authority of a king with the state of a monk who lives in conformity with true and Christian philosophy[4] *(ἡ κατὰ Χριστὸν φιλοσοφία* i. e. the life of perfection). Chrysostom was only a deacon when he wrote the three books to Stagirius *(πρὸς Σταγείριον ἀσκητὴν δαιμονῶντα)*[5], a treatise of consolation addressed to a sorely tried and quasi-despairing friend, that he might recognize in his sufferings the loving purpose of divine Providence; the second and third books are largely devoted to a review of sacred history from Adam to St. Paul, with the purpose of proving that it is precisely the beloved of God who have always undergone the greatest tribulations. The six books on the priesthood *(περὶ ἱερωσύνης)*[6] were written to explain and justify his conduct on the occasion of his election as bishop about 373. As already narrated,

[1] *Migne*, PG., xlvii. 277—316. [2] Ib., xlvii. 393—422.
[3] Ib., xlvii. 319—386. [4] Ib., xlvii. 387—392. [5] Ib., xlvii. 423—494.
[6] Ib., xlvii. 623—692.

he fled from the burden, but kept his purpose secret and induced his intimate friend Basil to accept the proferred office. The first part of the apology (i. 1 to ii. 6) is devoted to proving that this stratagem and dissimulation merited praise rather than blame, since thereby a Christian flock obtained so good a shepherd; he goes on to explain in the second part (ii. 7 to vi. 13) that he refused the episcopal office, because he had not the requisite qualities and felt himself unequal to its responsibilities and perils. The work is thrown into the form of a dialogue between the two friends; Chrysostom is usually somewhat lofty and grave in his speech; but here he exhibits a peculiar depth of feeling, a melting tenderness, a delicacy and elegance of style that are not visible elsewhere. This dialogue has always been looked on as a Christian classic, by reason of the incomparable picture it offers of the dignity and grandeur of the priesthood. Internal evidence would suggest that it was written shortly after 373, did not Socrates assert[1] that it was written after the ordination of Chrysostom as deacon (381). The brief work «to a young widow» *(εἰς νεωτέραν χηρεύσασαν)*[2], probably written in 380—381, seeks to console her for the loss of her spouse, and the treatise on the state of widows *(περὶ μονανδρίας)*[3] is supposed to be contemporaneous with the preceding, and is often printed as its second book, or as an appendix; it recommends in general that all widows remain as they are, with reference to 1 Cor. vii. 40. Quite closely related is another work on the virginal state *(περὶ παρθενίας)*[4] written probably after 381, in which he expounds, in a warm and often glowing style, the word of the Apostle (1 Cor. vii. 38) that marriage is good but virginity better. The work might justly be considered as a commentary (cc. 24—84) on 1 Cor. vii. so much so that when, at a later date, in the course of his homiletic preaching, he came to that chapter, respectively to the virginal state, he was able to refer his hearers to this work: «in which I have set forth at length and with all possible precision (the Christian doctrine); hence I hold it superfluous to return now to that subject»[5]. He had scarcely entered on his office at Constantinople when he issued two pastoral letters, closely related in contents: one to the clerics who retained in their houses virgins consecrated to God *(πρὸς τοὺς ἔχοντας παρθένους συνεισάκτους)*[6], another concerning the unlawful custom of these virgins according to which they permitted men to dwell with them in their houses *(περὶ τοῦ τὰς κανονικὰς μὴ συνοικεῖν ἀνδράσιν)*[7]. A holy zeal breathes from these documents, often expressed in harsh and biting diction; it is scarcely to be wondered at that in certain circles they aroused per-

[1] Hist. eccl., vi. 3. [2] *Migne,* PG., xlviii. 599—610.
[3] Ib., xlviii. 609—620. [4] Ib., xlviii. 533—596.
[5] Hom. 19 in 1 Cor., n. 6. [6] *Migne,* PG., xlvii. 495—514.
[7] Ib., xlvii. 513—532.

manent dislike and opposition. Two other works date from the period of his second exile: in one he undertakes to show that no one can harm any man apart from his own co-operation *(ὅτι τὸν ἑαυτὸν μὴ ἀδικοῦντα οὐδεὶς παραβλάψαι δύναται)*[1], in the other he addresses those who are scandalized at the sad and gloomy outlook of the present *(πρὸς τοὺς σκανδαλισθέντας ἐπὶ ταῖς δυσημερίαις ταῖς γενομέναις)*[2]. It is always and everywhere in a man's own power to permit or to repel that which alone can harm him; the sorrows and the contradictions that now, as in much earlier days, fall to the lot of the just, ought not to raise doubts regarding an overruling Providence, even if the ways of God be not clear to us. Thus did the holy man encourage his loyal friends at home, while for himself he ate the bread of exile, and was often on the brink of the grave, often in want of the necessaries of existence[3].

9. LETTERS. — There are extant about 238 letters of St. Chrysostom[4], most of them quite brief, and nearly all dating from his second exile. Many of them are mere answers to correspondents in various quarters who seek to know something about his condition. Others give touching evidence of his pastoral zeal which embraced not only his own flock, but also the inhabitants of far barbarian lands. Most of them are consolatory in tone, addressed some to clerics or laymen involved in the sufferings of the Johannites, some to other followers and friends overwhelmed by the hopeless state of religion at Constantinople or by the increasing wretchedness of Chrysostom's own condition. The seventeen letters to Olympias, widow and deaconess, deserve special mention. They are both numerous and long, are exceptionally cordial and frank, and never weary of expatiating on the utility of sorrow and trial. In many of these letters there shines a soul so magnanimous as to be no longer accessible to external sorrow or wrong, so closely united with God as to seem long since ravished from the life of earth.

10. SPURIOUS WRITINGS. — To no other Greek ecclesiastical writer have so many works been falsely attributed. His homiletic fame caused a multitude of discourses to court popularity under his name. In almost every volume (of the De Montfaucon and Migne editions) there is a selection of spurious pieces, small in each volume, but large as a whole. The extraordinary authority of the holy doctor led, at a very early date, to the habit of extracting his utterances on a certain subject from various homilies and combining such excerpts into a new homily on the same subject. Of such *ἐκλογαί* or *Florilegia,* belonging materially but not formally to Chrysostom, there are 48 in the Migne edition[5] It is highly probable not only that

[1] *Migne,* PG., lii. 459—480.
[2] Ib., lii. 479—528.
[3] Cf. Ep. 4 ad Olymp., c. 4.
[4] *Migne,* PG., lii.
[5] Ib., lxiii. 567—902.

his genuine homilies were mutilated during his lifetime, but that downright forgeries were sent out under his name. The *Hom. in decoll. S. Ioan. Bapt.* is a case in point (see no. 5). The so-called liturgy of St. Chrysostom[1] can lay no claim to his name, except on the supposition that in later times it has undergone many and important changes. The occasional remarks of a liturgical character in his writings are not applicable to this liturgy, nor are its *formulae* in mutual agreement. The Ethiopic liturgy of St. Chrysostom, edited in 1866 by A. Dillmann, has no more in common with the Greek liturgy of Chrysostom than with any other liturgy. There are very strong reasons to suspect the genuineness of the *Synopsis veteris et novi Testamenti*[2], a kind of introduction to the Scripture, in which the contents of each biblical book is briefly described, and its importance and place in the history of revelation made clear. So far only the part that deals with the Old Testament is known, and even that is not quite complete. A careful investigation is needed of the relations of this synopsis towards the one falsely attributed to Athanasius (§ 63, 5). The *Opus imperfectum in Matthaeum* printed in the editions of the works of Chrysostom[3] is a commentary on Matthew, whose text, though fragmentary, is very remarkable; it is now known to be the production of some Latin Arian of the fifth or sixth century.

11. CHRYSOSTOM AS HOMILIST. — About the middle of the tenth century, Suidas wrote in his Lexicon concerning «John of Antioch surnamed the Golden Mouth»: «His words resounded more loudly than the cataracts of the Nile. Since the world began, no one else has ever possessed such gifts as an orator; he alone, it may be said, possessed them all in their fulness, and alone merited rightly the name of Golden Mouth and divine orator.» In the later ecclesiastical literature, perhaps so far back as the fifth century, the name of John gave way to that of Chrysostom. Even to this day the Golden-Mouth is reckoned the prince of Eastern orators, with whom in the West only Augustine can compare. The pulpit is the peculiar province of Chrysostom who sought and found therein, far more than did Augustine, the scene of his labors. He is, in fact, cast in another mould. It is not theory but practice, not science but life, that attracts and fascinates Chrysostom; his discourse is dialectic and speculative only when external considerations obtrude themselves on him; otherwise he is entirely occupied with the solicitudes and duties of an every-day pastoral ministry. Augustine, moreover, deals with the theory of sacerdotal eloquence (§ 94, 9), while, apart from an occasional brief remark, and some chapters in the fourth and fifth books of his *De sacerdotio* on the grandeur and difficulties of the

[1] Ib., lxiii. 901—922. [2] Ib., lvi. 313—386. [3] Ib., lvi. 611—946.

homilist's office, Chrysostom has nowhere commented on or explained his homiletic principles. There was, indeed, no difference between their principles, neither contradiction nor opposition, only in practice they worked out differently. To consider only the length of their discourses, how different is the *breviloquium* of Augustine from the *μακρολογία* of Chrysostom! The latter can often hardly finish in two hours, the former is often content with fifteen minutes; but the preaching of Augustine makes other demands on the mind of the hearer than that of Chrysostom. The former loves a well-defined theme, in the treatment of which he moves on with steadiness, his eyes fixed on the conclusion which he pursues along a strictly dialectic line; his manner is often so abstract that his audience must have followed him with difficulty. The latter is very diffuse, and easily abandons his theme, for the momentary pleasure of gathering the wayside flowers; he is less wearisome and more entertaining; many of his sermons are really mosaics of small independent compositions. Chrysostom is also less fatiguing in the exposition of a particular doctrine. While Augustine very rarely interrupts the flow of his thought by examples and similes, Chrysostom is convinced that he can accomplish more by lively images than by theoretical arguments; indeed, he is a past master in the art of individualizing, and makes all things subservient to that end. It is true that Augustine compensates, in a way at least, his more intelligent hearers by his splendid antitheses, his brilliant *jeux d'esprit,* and his endless playing upon words, tricks of rhetoric that are quite secondary in the discourse of Chrysostom. The latter is also (in a good sense) more the *impromptu* speaker than Augustine; in the exordium and the peroration of his discourse he often seizes happily on some fact or interest quite recent and actual, and thus enlists into his service even the transient events of the day. By far the greater part of the extant discourses of Chrysostom are homilies. Augustine also wrote, in addition to his Sermones, many *Enarrationes* and *Tractatus* on biblical texts. In their exegesis the two orators also follow divergent methods. Augustine seldom checks his allegorizing tendency, while Chrysostom, educated in the theological school of Antioch, is usually faithful to its historico-philological method and principles. He aims first at establishing the literal sense, and, with this end in view, often prefixes an historical introduction, or will even stop to clear up grammatical difficulties. In his comment on Is. i. 22[1] he remarks that, while he will not reject the allegorical interpretation, he holds the literal sense to be the truer one *(ἀληθεστέραν εἶναί φημι)*; on Is. v. 7[2] he says that Holy Scripture itself indicates when and where the tropical interpretation is admissible or obligatory»: if it allegorizes,

[1] *Migne,* PG., lvi. 23. [2] Ib., lvi. 60.

it also gives an interpretation of the allegory *(πανταχοῦ τῆς γραφῆς οὗτος ὁ νόμος, ἐπειδὰν ἀλληγορῇ, λέγειν καὶ ἀλληγορίας τὴν ἑρμηνείαν)*; commenting on Is. vi. 6 ff.[1] he mentions first the figurative interpretation but adds: «we hold fast, however, to the historical sense» *(ἡμεῖς δὲ τέως τῆς ἱστορίας ἐχόμεθα)*. In a word, Chrysostom is a decided and consistent disciple of the great masters of Antiochene exegesis, though never so extreme as Theodore of Mopsuestia; indeed, he is himself one of the foremost masters of which that school can boast. His distinctive characteristic is the ease with which, not only in exegesis, but in pulpit oratory, he unites and reconciles science and life, mind and heart; no one has ever interpreted Holy Scripture so successfully as Chrysostom, with such thoroughness and prudence, one might say, with such sobriety and accuracy, yet again with so much depth and comprehensiveness. If we add to all these qualities a certain delicacy and refinement, we shall understand why in his hands the Scriptures became such a source of living progress in every province of religious life.

12. THE DOCTRINE OF CHRYSOSTOM. — His hermeneutical principles make him the very antithesis of Origen; no accusation is more groundless than that of Origenism made by Theophilus of Alexandria (see no. 4) against the great exegete. It may be looked on as certain, though positive evidence is wanting, that, with regard to the origin of the human soul, Chrysostom was a firm believer in Creatianism and not in the pre-existence doctrine of Origen. Hence the doctrine of Apocatastasis or «general restoration» in the sense of Origen (and Gregory of Nyssa) was quite foreign to his principles; one need only listen to what he says concerning the pains of the damned: «Hell is not sufficient, although eternal, to wash away the stains of sin; for that reason it is eternal *(διὰ τοῦτο γὰρ καὶ αἰώνιός ἐστιν)*[2]. His teaching on original sin brought about a controversy between Augustine and Julian of Eclanum. In an apparently lost homily *De baptizatis,* Chrysostom had said apropos of an enumeration of the effects of baptismal grace: «therefore do we baptize also little children *(τὰ παιδία)* although they have no sins *(καίτοι ἁμαρτήματα οὐχ ἔχοντα)*.» Julian imagined[3] that these words were equivalent to the Pelagian negation of original sin. Augustine rightly replied[4] that Chrysostom meant actual sins (propria peccata), as the plural *ἁμαρτήματα* and the context prove. Elsewhere, on several occasions, Chrysostom openly taught the existence of original sin, especially in the following five passages: *Ep. 3 ad Olymp., c. 3*[5]*; De resuscitat. Lazari (?); Hom. 9 in Gen., n. 4*[6]*; Hom. de baptizatis (?); Hom. 10 in Rom., n. 1 2 4*[7]. In all these quotations, nevertheless, so far as

[1] Ib., lvi. 72. [2] Hom. 17 in Hebr., n. 5 (*Migne,* PG., lxiii. 133—134).
[3] Libri iv ad Turbantium episc. [4] Contra Iulianum, i. 22.
[5] *Migne,* PG., lii. 574. [6] Ib., liii. 78—79. [7] Ib., lx. 475—476 479—480.

we can now identify them, especially in the quotation from the commentary on Rom. v. 12 ff., the interpretation of Chrysostom does not coincide exactly with the ideas of Augustine on the nature of original sin. He frequently repeats that the consequences or penalties of the first sin affect not only our first parents, but also their descendants, but he does not, however, say that the sin itself was inherited by their posterity and is inherent in their nature. In general, to appreciate the homiletic teaching of Chrysostom apropos of sin it is well to remember that he had in mind Manichæan adversaries with their denial of free-will and their doctrine of physically irresistible concupiscence, an error that cut away the foundations of all morality, and one he opposed with all his might. As to his relations with Pelagianism, the rule that St. Augustine formulated on another occasion[1] may well be recalled: Quid opus est, ut eorum scrutemur opuscula qui, priusquam ista hæresis oriretur, non habuerunt necessitatem in hac difficili ad solvendum quaestione versari? quod procul dubio facerent, si respondere talibus cogerentur. — The fact that Theodore of Mopsuestia was the father of Nestorianism naturally raises a question as to the attitude of Chrysostom toward the teaching of his friend. Our Saint insists with earnestness on the reality and integrity of the two natures in Christ: Christ was of the same nature as the Father *(τῆς αὐτῆς οὐσίας τῷ πατρί)*: *Hom. 1 in Matth., n. 2*[2]; *Hom. 4 contra Anomoeos, n. 4*[3]; He had also a human body (Rom. viii. 3), not sinful like ours, but in nature identical with ours *(σάρκα ἀναμάρτητον τῇ φύσει τὴν αὐτὴν ἡμῖν)*: *Hom. 13 in Rom., n. 5*[4]; *Hom. 7 in Phil., n. 2—3*[5]. Despite the duality of natures, there is but one Christ: «Remaining what He was, He assumed what He was not, and though He became man, remained God the Word *(ἔμενε θεὸς λόγος ὤν)* He became that which He assumed, but He was the other. Thus there is no confusion, but also no separation. One God, one Christ, the Son of God (1 Tim. ii. 5)! But when I say one (one Christ), I mean thereby a union and not a commingling *(ἕνωσιν λέγω, οὐ σύγχυσιν)*, not that one nature is transmuted into another, but is united to that other (Hom. 7 in Phil., n. 2 3)[6]. He does not anywhere undertake a more exact and precise determination of the meaning of the words *(εἷς Χριστός)*. Theodore seeks to prove that in Christ there could be only a moral, not a physical, union of the two natures; Chrysostom confined himself to general and rather popular terms and phrases. Even in the absence of such a mental attitude, no special stress should be laid on the fact that Chrysostom, like Theodore, makes the Logos dwell in the man Christ as in a temple (In Ps. xliv. 3)[7] and in the commentary

[1] De praedest. sanctorum, c. 14, n. 27. [2] *Migne,* PG., lvii. 17.
[3] Ib., xlviii. 732 f. [4] Ib., lx. 515. [5] Ib., lxii. 229—232.
[6] Ib., lxii. 231 232. [7] Ib., lv. 186.

(of doubtful authenticity) on Prov. ix. 1[1]. It is true, however, that the unique personality of the God-Man does not strike the reader with absolute distinctness in the writings of Chrysostom; in his presentation of our Lord the divinity and the humanity appear in a way as apart from and external to one another; nowhere does the one and sole personal principle or subject of the life and sufferings of Christ stand forth in unmistakable outline. Our author continues to pay homage to an academical opinion of the Antiochene school, i. e. the notion more or less consciously entertained that there could not be in Christ a perfect and complete human nature without a proper (and purely human) personality. — Historians of the dogma of the Holy Eucharist have always held Chrysostom in high repute, so that he is called the *doctor eucharistiae,* because of the numerous clear, positive and detailed statements that he makes concerning this doctrine. Pointing to the altar, he says: «Christ lies there slain» *(ἐσφαγμένος πρόκειται ὁ Χριστός)*[2]. «His body lies before us now»[3]. «That which is in the Chalice is the same as what flowed from the side of Christ». «What is the Bread? The Body of Christ»[4] «Reflect, O man, what sacrificial flesh *(θυσία)* thou takest in thy hand!» (it was then the custom to place the Host in the right hand of the communicant), to what table thou wilt approach. Remember that, though dust and ashes, thou dost receive the Blood and the Body of Christ»[5]. In order to make as clear as possible the truth and reality of the presence of our Lord in the Blessed Sacrament, Chrysostom loves to transfer to the substance of the Body and the Blood what is strictly true of the accidents of bread and wine. «Not only ought we to see the Lord», he says, «but we ought to take Him in our hands, eat Him, set our teeth upon His flesh *(ἐμπῆξαι τοὺς ὀδόντας τῇ σαρκί)* and most intimately unite ourselves with Him»[6]. »What the Lord did not tolerate on the Cross», i. e. the breaking of His legs, «He tolerates now in the sacrifice *(ἐπὶ τῆς προσφορᾶς)* through love of thee; He permits Himself to be broken in pieces *(ἀνέχεται διακλώμενος)* that all may be filled to satiety»[7] Moreover, Chrysostom reads in 1 Cor. xi. 24: *τὸ ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν κλώμενον,* and he maintains also that even at the Last Supper the Lord was broken in parts *(ἐκλάσθη)*[8]. His frequent statements that now the altar and now the tongue of the communicant are stained *(φοινίσσεσθαι)* by the Blood of the Lord may be explained by the use

[1] Ib., lxiv. 680.
[2] Hom. 1 and 2 de prodit. Iudae, n. 6: *Migne,* PG., xlix. 381 390.
[3] Hom. 50 in Matth., n. 2: Ib., lviii. 507.
[4] Hom. 24 in 1 Cor., n. 1, 2: Ib., lxi. 200.
[5] Hom. in diem nat. D. N. I. C., n. 7: Ib., xlix. 361.
[6] Hom. 46 in Ioan., n. 3: Ib., lix. 260.
[7] Hom. 24 in 1 Cor., n. 2: Ib., lxi. 200.
[8] Hom. 27 in 1 Cor., n. 3—4: Ib., lxi. 228—229.

of red wine in the Mass[1]. The Body and Blood of the Lord are therefore sacrificed, and eaten, or drunk. But the sacrificial priest and the host at the banquet is none other than the Lord Himself, «Believe that there takes place now the same banquet as that in which Christ sat at table, and that this banquet is in no way different from that *(οὐδὲν διενήνοχεν)*. For it is not true that this banquet is prepared by a man while that was prepared by Himself, but both this banquet and that one are prepared by Himself»[2] «To-day as then, it is the Lord who worketh and offereth all»[3]. The priest at the altar is only an instrument in the hand of the Lord. «We assume the role of servants; it is He who consecrates and transmutes (the bread and wine) *(ὁ δὲ ἁγιάζων αὐτὰ καὶ μετασκευάζων αὐτός)*[4]. «It is not man who causes what is present to become the Body and Blood of Christ, but Christ Himself who was crucified for us. The priest is the representative when he pronounces those words (of consecration) *(σχῆμα πληρῶν, τὰ ῥήματα φθεγγόμενος ἐκεῖνα)*; but the power and the grace are those of the Lord. He says: 'This is my Body' This word changes the things that lie before us» *(τοῦτο τὸ ῥῆμα μεταῤῥυθμίζει τὰ προκείμενα)*[5]. For the terms *μετασκευάζειν* and *μεταῤῥυθμίζειν* the so-called Liturgy of St. Chrysostom substitutes *μεταβάλλειν*[6]. On the strength of a letter *ad Cæsarium monachum,* Chrysostom has often been quoted, curiously enough, in behalf of consubstantiation. That letter, however, of which the Greek text is lost, is very probably spurious. The words in question are that after the consecration the Bread is called *dominicum corpus, etiamsi natura panis in ipso permansit*[7]. But here *natura panis* clearly means the external appearance of the Bread as distinguished from its substance.

13. COMPLETE AND PARTIAL EDITIONS. — The writings of Chrysostom were so highly esteemed and so widely diffused that we possess very abundant and excellent materials for the reconstruction of his text, partly Greek codices and partly ancient versions from the Greek. So far only a small portion of these manuscripts has been drawn upon. We owe complete editions of his works to the labors of the Jesuit *Fronton du Duc* (Fronto Ducaeus), of the Anglican *H. Savile,* and of the Benedictine *B. de Montfaucon.* The edition of Fronto Ducaeus was published at Paris, 1609—1633 in 12 vols. (Greek and Latin) and reprinted ib., 1636; Frankfort, 1697—1698 1723; Mayence, 1702. The Savile edition was brought out at Eton in 8 vols., 1612 (Greek text only). The edition of de Montfaucon was publish ed at Paris, 1718—1738 in 13 vols., and reprinted at Venice, 1734 to 1741 in 13 vols.; again 1780 in 14 vols. It was reprinted also at Paris, with a few corrections 1834—1840 in 13 vols. The same edition, with a

[1] Hom. 24 in 1 Cor., n. 1: Ib., lxi. 200; De sacerd., 3, 4: Ib., xlviii. 642; Hom. 82 in Matth., n. 5: Ib., lviii. 743; Catech. 2 ad illum., c. 2: Ib., xlix. 234.

[2] Hom. 50 in Matth., n 3: Ib., lviii. 507.

[3] Hom. 27 in 1 Cor., n. 4: Ib., lxi. 229.

[4] Hom. 82 in Matth., n. 5: Ib., lviii. 744.

[5] Hom. 1 and (almost identical) Hom. 2 de prodit. Iudae, n. 6: Ib., xlix. 380 and 389.

[6] *Migne,* PG., lxiii. 916. [7] Ib., lii. 758.

large supplement, is in *Migne,* PG., xlvii—lxiv. It is worthy of note that in Migne the 90 homilies on Matthew are not given in the text of de Montfaucon, but according to the later edition of Field (see below). Modern scholars agree that the best text is that given by Savile, and that to the Paris edition de Montfaucon probably did no more than lend the authority of his name, at least so far as text-criticism goes; much certainly remains to be done. Cf. *P. de Lagarde,* Ankündigung einer neuen ausgabe der griech. übersezung des alten testaments, Göttingen, 1882, p. 50. A systematic collection of all the Chrysostom-manuscripts was inaugurated by *J. Paulson,* in his Symbolae ad Chrysostomum Patrem i—ii, Lund, 1889 to 1890, and Notice sur un manuscrit de St. Jean Chrysostome utilisé par Erasme et conservé à la bibliothèque royale de Stockholm, Lund, 1890. — Since the Montfaucon edition some works of Chrysostom have undergone a new critical text-revision. *J. A. Bengel* († 1752) did much for the text of the De sacerdotio; his edition (Stuttgart, 1725, Greek and Latin) was widely diffused through the stereotyped edition of *Tauchnitz* (Leipzig, 1825 1865 1872 1887, Greek only). The Bengel edition is also the basis of the separate editions (Greek only) of De sacerd. of *E. Leo,* Leipzig, 1834, and *C. Seltmann,* Münster and Paderborn, 1887 (Greek only). *D. Euelpides* undertook a new recension of the text; so far as I know, only the «first part» of his edition, an introduction and the first book, have appeared, Athens, 1867. *A. Cognet,* De Chrysostomi dialogo qui inscribitur περὶ ἱερωσύνης λόγοι ἓξ, Paris, 1900 (Thèse). *J. A. Nairn's* edition of the De sacerdotio of St. John Chrysostom (in Cambridge Patristic Texts) appeared in 1906. *Chr. Fr. Matthaei* paid special attention to the reclassification of some homily-texts, first edited by de Montfaucon; there is a catalogue of his contributions in *Fabricius-Harles,* Bibl. Gr., viii. 575. A thorough examination of the text of the 90 homilies on Matthew and all the homilies on the Pauline Epistles was undertaken by *Fr. Field;* the text of the 90 homilies was published at Cambridge, 1839, 3 vols. (Greek only), and that of the Pauline homilies at Oxford, 1849—1855, 5 vols. (Greek only). The Field edition passed quite unnoticed in Germany. Single homilies have also been edited with more or less text-revision; thus the (dubious or spurious) Hom. de beato Abraham (*Migne,* PG., l. 737—746) by *L. de Sinner,* Paris, 1835; the Hom. in Flaviani episc. reditum (= Hom. 21 de statuis: ib., xlix. 211—222) by *L. de Sinner,* Paris, 1842, and by *E. Ragon,* Paris, 1887 1893; the Hom. in Eutropium (Ib., lii. 391—396) by *Fr. Dübner* and *E. Lefranc,* Paris, 1855, and by *E. Sommer,* Paris, 1889 1890 1893, by *E. R. Maloney,* Boston, 1900; the Hom. 20 in 1 Cor. (Ib., lxi. 159—170) by *A. R. Alvin,* Linköping, 1885; L'Eloge des saints martyrs et homélie après le tremblement de terre, by *E. Ragon,* Paris, 1903. *Fr W Lomler* published at Rudolstadt (1840) a small selection of the works of the Saint: Ioannis Chrysostomi opera praestantissima (Greek and Latin, 4°, and 8° Greek only). The collection of *Fr Dübner,* S. Ioannis Chrysostomi opera selecta graece et latine vol. i (the only one published), Paris, 1861, contains more and is based on a better study of the manuscripts. Brief but remarkable additions to the text-criticism of some works, especially homilies, were made by *S. Haidacher,* in Zeitschr. f. kath. Theol. (1894), xviii. 405—411 762—764; (1895) xix. 162—165 387—389; (1897) xxi. 398—400; (1901) xxv. 365—367; (1902) xxvi. 190—194 380—385 and lately in Studien über Chrysostomus-Eklogen, Vienna, 1902, in Sitzungsberichte (1902), cxliv. *J. Cozza-Luzi* has edited the Hom. de vita functis, with an introduction and a Latin translation, in the Nova Patrum Bibliotheca, part I, Rome, 1905, x. 167—194. The homily on the words «Hic est filius meus dilectus» (*Migne,* PG., lxiv. 33

to 38) belongs to Gregory, a priest of Antioch (Ib., lxxxviii. 1871 f.). — *A. Hilgenfeld*, Des Chrysostomos Lobrede auf Polykarp, in Zeitschr. für wissensch. Theologie (1902), xlv. 569—572; *J. Bidez*, Description d'un manuscrit hagiographique grec palimpseste avec des fragments d'un panégyrique de S. Polycarp attribué à Saint Jean Chrysostome, in Bulletin de la Classe des Letters etc. of the Royal Academy of Brussels, 1900, pp. 577 to 624 (Ib., lxiv. 505—656).

The latest editions of the so-called Liturgy of Chrysostom are those by *H. A. Daniel*, Codex liturgicus ecclesiae orient. (Cod. lit. eccl. univ. iv), Leipzig, 1853, pp. 327—420; *C. A. Swainson*, The Greek Liturgies, chiefly from original authorities, Cambridge, 1884, pp. 88—94 99—148; *F. E. Brightman*, Liturgies Eastern and Western, Oxford, 1896, i. *J. Cozza-Luzi* has published the Antiochene Liturgy from a Vatican Ms., in the Nova Patrum Bibliotheca, part II, x. 30—116. On this liturgy the reader may consult *F. Probst*, Liturgie des 4. Jahrhunderts und deren Reform, Münster, 1893, pp. 412—455. The liturgy published by Dillmann under the title Oratio eucharistica S. Ioannis Chrys. in his Chrestomathia aethiopica, Leipzig, 1866, pp. 51—56, differs notably from the Chrysostom-Liturgy. A German version of Dillmann's text was made by *A. Schulte*, in Der Katholik (1888), i. 417—425. In his edition of the Didache, from the same manuscript of the year 1056, Constantinople, 1883, Proleg., pp. 109—147, *Ph. Bryennios* contributed some new readings to the text of the Synopsis Vet. et Nov. Test. (*Migne*, PG., lvi. 313—386), as also an unedited fragment of the work (The synopsis of the last five minor prophets). See § 63, 11 for the views of *Zahn* and *Klostermann* apropos of the Pseudo-Athanasian Synopsis, and *C. P. Caspari*, Ungedruckte, unbeachtete und wenig beachtete Quellen zur Geschichte des Taufsymbols und der Glaubensregel, Christiania, 1869, ii. 225—244: Zwei Chrysostomus beigelegte Homilien über das Symbol (Latin homilies of the end of the fifth or the beginning of the sixth century, already edited, but not published in the Montfaucon edition). — The reader will have already noticed that many writings of Chrysostom were discovered after the edition of Montfaucon, while others previously published were not reprinted by him. The Catena on Jeremias published by M. Ghisler in his commentary on that prophet (Lyons, 1623, 3 vols.) contains many scholia under the name of Chrysostom (*Migne*, PG., lxiv. 739—1038). In the Catena on Job edited by *P. Junius* (Patrick Young), London, 1637, there is often question of Chrysostom (Ib., lxiv. 505—656), *A. M. Bandini* (Graecae Ecclesiae vet. monumenta, Florence, 1762—1763, ii. 182—184) published a small Specimen expositionis S. Ioannis Chrys. in Iobum (Ib., lxiv. 503—506). *A. Mai* (Nova Patr. Bibl. iv 2, 153—201) published from a Proverb-Catena several scholia under the name of Chrysostom (Ib. lxiv. 659—740). Similarly, *J. A. Cramer* edited (Oxford, 1840) several Chrysostom-scholia from a Catena on the Catholic Epistles (Ib., lxiv. 1039—1062). The conclusion of the eighteenth homily on Genesis, wanting in earlier editions, was published by *J. A. Mingarelli* (Graeci codices mss. apud Nanios patricios asservati, Bologne, 1784, pp. 53—54; *Migne*, PG., lxiv. 499—502). *Bandini* published (l. c., ii. 1—23) a non-exegetical discourse of doubtful authenticity: Hom. in poenitentiam Ninivitarum (Ib., lxiv. 423—434). *Gallandi* printed, in Bibl. vet. Patr. xiv, App. 136—140, a Hom. de eleemosyna et in divitem ac Lazarum (Ib., lxiv. 433—444), declared spurious by *S. Haidacher*, in Zeitschr. f. kathol. Theol. (1901), xxv. 366. *Chr. Fr. Matthaei*, Gregorii Thessalon. x orationes, Moscow, 1776, pp. 126—135, made known a Hom. in decem millia talenta et centum denarios et de oblivione iniuriarum (Ib., lxiv. 443—452). From a Dresden codex of the

ninth century *M. Guil. Theod. Maur Becher* edited Ioannis Chrys. homiliae v, Leipzig, 1839, miscellaneous in contents and of doubtful genuineness (Ib., lxiv. 451—492). Haidacher has shown (l. c., 367) that one of them, the seventh among the spurious homilies on the words «omne peccatum» etc. (Ib., lxiv. 465—473), is a homily of Gregory of Nyssa (Ib., xlvi. 490—498). In the Spicil. Rom. iv, pp. lxviii—lxxvi, *Mai* made known a Hom. de s. Pentecoste (Ib., lxiv. 417—424). A Coptic homily of Chrysostom is printed in *Rossi,* i. papiri Copti del Museo Egizio di Torino, Turin, 1888, ii. 1.

14. VERSIONS. — Among the ancient versions of the works of Chrysostom the Syriac, Latin and Armenian are most helpful for the textual criticism of his writings. *De Lagarde* has described (Ankündigung etc., p. 51) the unedited Syriac versions in the sixth-, seventh- and eighth- century codices of the British Museum. So far as I know only one Syriac version has been printed, that of the spurious or at least very doubtful Hom. de eleemosyna (*Migne,* PG., lx. 707—712) under the title Sermo S. Ioannis de divitiis et paupertate, in Monumenta syriaca. Praefatus est *P. Zingerle,* Innsbruck, 1869, i. 117—123. — A certain Anianus (Annianus), probably the deacon of that name from Celeda who wrote (ca. 418) a polemical pro-Pelagian work against Jerome (*Hier.,* Ep. 143, 2), translated several works of Chrysostom into Latin. On Anianus see *Schoenemann,* Bibl. hist.-litt. Patrum lat., ii. 473—480. Montfaucon's edition contains the version by Anianus of the first eight homilies on Matthew (*Migne,* PG., lviii. 975 to 1058) and of the seven panegyrics on Saint Paul (Ib., l. 471—514). The earlier editions of Chrysostom contain a Latin version of 25 homilies; cf. *G. Mercati,* Note di letteratura bibl. e crist. antica (Studi e Testi, v), 1901, pp. 140—144. *W Schmitz* is of opinion that Anianus made the translation or paraphrase of the two books on penance attributed to Chrysostom. Monumenta tachygraphica codicis Parisiensis lat. 2718, transcripsit, adnotavit, edidit *Guil. Schmitz,* Hannover, 1882—1883, fasc. 2, S. Johannis Chrys. De cordis compunctione libros ii latine versos continens. The 34 homilies on Hebrews were translated into Latin at the suggestion of Cassiodorus (Instit. i. 8) by a certain Mutianus; they are included in the Montfaucon edition (*Migne,* PG., lxiii. 237—456); cf. *Looshorn,* Die lateinischen Übersetzungen des hl. Joh. Chrysostomus im Mittelalalter, nach den Handschriften der Münchener Hof- und Staatsbibliothek, in Zeitschr. f. kath. Theol. (1880), iv. 788—793. — Many Armenian versions have been edited by the Mechitarists of San Lazzaro near Venice. They published in 1818 two quarto volumes with «Orations» of Chrysostom, in 1826 three octavo volumes followed containing the Matthew- (and some other) homilies. The Encomium S. Gregorii Armenorum Illuminatoris (*Migne,* PG., lxiii. 943—954), non extant in Greek and of doubtful authenticity, was published in Armenian (1853), in Armenian and Latin (1878). In 1861 there appeared another volume of «Orations», and in 1862 two volumes entitled »Exposition of the Epistles of Paul» (cf. *de Lagarde,* l. c., pp. 52—54 for the contents of these three volumes). Finally in 1887 they printed an octavo edition of the Exposition of Isaias in a defective Latin version made from the Armenian. The Mechitarists published also (Venice, 1839) an Armenian commentary on the Acts of the Apostles compiled from the works of Chrysostom and St. Ephrem and (Vienna, 1849, Armenian and Greek) a «collection of ancient versions from the original Greek» that begins with some Matthew-homilies of Chrysostom. — Among the most recent German versions are the following: Chrysostomus-Postille. Eine Auswahl des Schönsten aus den Predigten des hl. Chrysostomus. Für Prediger und zur Privaterbauung. Ausgewählt und aus dem Grundtexte

übersetzt von *C. J. Hefele,* Tübingen, 1845 1850 1857. *Fr. Knors,* Homilien über die sonntäglichen Episteln des kath. Kirchenjahrs, nach Chrysostomus, Schaffhausen, 1854; *Id.*, Des hl. Joh. Chrysostomus Homilien über das Evangelium des hl. Matthäus. Aus dem Griechischen übersetzt, Regensburg, 1857, 2 vols.; *Id.*, Die Homilien des hl. Joh. Chrysostomus über das Evangelium des hl. Johannes, Paderborn, 1862. *J. Fluck* began a version of the ascetical works of our Saint, Freiburg, 1864, i. Ten volumes of the Bibliothek der Kirchenväter (1869—1884) are devoted to the versions of selected works of Chrysostom: the six books on the priesthood, the work on virginity, the (first) letter to Theodore, and the nine homilies on penance were translated by *J. Chr Mitterrutzner* and *J. Rupp* (vol. i); the 21 homilies on the statues by *Mitterrutzner* (vol. ii); selected discourses with the letters to Pope Innocent and to Olympias by *M. Schmitz* (vol. iii); all the homilies on the Pauline Epistles by *J. Wimmer, Mitterrutzner, A. Hartl, J Schwertschlager, N. Liebert, B. Sepp* (vol. iv—x). — An English version of many writings of Chrysostom is published in the select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church (series I), edited by *Ph. Schaff* (vol. ix—xiv), New York, 1888—1890. — A French version of all writings of the Saint was brought out under the direction of M. Jeannin, Bar-le-Duc, 1861—1867, and reprinted, Arras, 1887—1888, in eleven volumes.

15. WORKS ON CHRYSOSTOM. — *J. Stilting,* De S. Ioanne Chrys. commentarius historicus, in Acta SS. Sept., Antwerp, 1753, iv. 401—709. *Fabricius-Harles,* Bibl. Gr., viii. 454—583: De S. Ioanne Chrys. *J. de Rubeis,* De peccato originali tractatus theologicus, c. xxv. Vindiciae Ioannis Chrysostomi (reprinted, Würzburg, 1857). *J. Habert,* Theologiae Graecorum Patrum circa materiam gratiae libri tres, c. xxiv· De mente S. Chrysostomi etc. (reprinted, Würzburg, 1863). *A. Neander,* Der hl. Joh. Chrysostomus und die Kirche, besonders des Orients, in dessen Zeitalter, Berlin, 1821—1822, 2 vols., 2. ed. 1832, 3. ed. 1848 1858. *Villemain,* L'éloquence chrétienne, Paris. *Fr. Böhringer,* Die Kirche Christi und ihre Zeugen oder die Kirchengeschichte in Biographien, part IV, Zürich, 1846, i. 1—160: Chrysostomus; 161—169. Olympias. *Fr.* and *P. Böhringer,* Johannes Chrysostomus und Olympias, 2. ed., Stuttgart, 1876. *E. Martin,* S. Jean Chrysostome, ses œuvres et son siècle, Montpellier, 1860, 3 vols. *Rochet,* Histoire de S. Jean Chrysostome, patriarche de Constantinople, Paris, 1866, 2 vols. *A. Thierry,* S. Jean Chrysostome et l'impératrice Eudoxie, Paris, 1874. *Fr. X. Funk,* Joh. Chrysostomus und der Hof von Konstantinopel, in Theol. Quartalschr. (1875), lvii. 449—480, and in Kirchengeschichtliche Abhandlungen und Untersuchungen (1899), ii. 23—44. *F. Ludwig,* Der hl. Joh. Chrysostomus in seinem Verhältnis zum byzantinischen Hof, Brunsberg, 1883. *A. Puech,* St. Jean Chrysostome, Paris, 1900 (Les Saints). *P. Ubaldi,* La Sinode ad Quercum dell' anno 403, in Memorie della R. Accademia delle scienze di Torino, ser. II (1902), lii. 33—97. *A. Caldana,* S. Giovanni Crisostomo. Studio storico letterario, Vicenza, 1899. *J. Lutz,* Chrysostomus und die übrigen berühmtesten Redner alter und neuer Zeit, Tübingen, 1846, 2. ed., 1859. *P. Albert,* St. Jean Chrysostome considéré comme orateur populaire, Paris, 1858. *L. da Volturino,* Studii oratorii sopra S. Giovanni Crisostomo rispetto al modo di predicare dignitosamente e fruttuosamente, Quaracchi, 1884. *Matthes,* Der Unterschied in der Predigtweise des Chrysostomus und Augustinus, in Pastoralblätter f. Homiletik, Katechetik und Seelsorge (1888), xxx. 40—71. *L. Ackermann,* Die Beredsamkeit des hl. Joh. Chrysostomus, Würzburg, 1889. *Th. Förster,* Chrysostomus in seinem Verhältnis zur antiochenischen Schule, ein Beitrag zur Dogmengeschichte, Gotha, 1869. *F H. Chase,* Chrysostom: a Study in the History of Biblical Interpreta-

tion, London, 1887. *S. Haidacher,* Die Lehre des hl. Joh. Chrysostomus über die Schriftinspiration, Salzburg, 1897. *S. K. Gifford,* Pauli epistolas qua forma legerit Joh. Chrysostomus, Halle, 1902. *P. Batiffol,* Quelques homilies de St. Jean Chrysostome et la version gothique des écritures, in Revue biblique (1899), viii. 566—572. *A. Nägele,* Die Eucharistielehre des hl. Joh. Chrysostomus, Freiburg i. Br., 1900 (Strassburger theol. Studien, iii. 4—5). *F Renz,* Die Geschichte des Messopferbegriffs, i. 391—415: Ioannes Chrysostomus, Freising-München, 1901. *E. Michaud,* St. Jean Chrysostome et l'Eucharistie, in Revue internat. de Théol. (1903), pp. 93 to 111. *J. Chapman,* St. Chrysostomus on St. Peter, in Dublin Review (1903), pp. 73—99. *V. Schmitt,* Die Verheissung der Eucharistie (St. John, c. vi) bei den Antiochenern Cyrillus von Jerusalem und Joh. Chrysostomus, Würzburg, 1903. In Religionsgeschichtl. Untersuchungen, Bonn, 1889, i. 215 to 240, *H. Usener* touches on the date of some of the homilies of Chrysostom. In Jahrbücher der christl. Kirche unter dem Kaiser Theodosius d. Gr., Freiburg i. Br., 1897, pp. 565—574, *G. Rauschen* describes the literary labors of Chrysostom in the period that preceded his appearance as public preacher at Antioch. *E. Michaud,* L'Ecclésiologie de St. Jean Chrysostome, in Revue Internat. de Théologie (1903), pp. 491—530. *Dom Baur,* S. Chrysostome et ses œuvres dans l'histoire littéraire, Louvain, 1907 *G. Bareille,* S. Jean Chrysostome. A series of articles in the Revue Thomiste. The first article appeared in 1907 (pp. 561—583). — The letters of Chrysostom have been studied by *P Ubaldi,* in Bessarione Di una lettera (n. 125, ad Ciriacum) di S. Gio. Crisostomo (v. 1900—1901; viii. 244—264; it is not the work of Chrysostom); La lettera 233 al vescovo di Antiochia (ib., ser. ii. 1, 1901—1902, 69—79; it is not the work of Chrysostom); Gli epiteti esornativi nelle lettere di S. Gio. Crisostomo (ib., 304—332).

16. NECTARIUS OF CONSTANTINOPLE. MARCUS DIACONUS. — Nectarius (see no. 3) left a Sermo de festo S. Theodori et de ieiunio et eleemosyna (*Migne,* PG., xxxix. 1821—1840). — The Vita S. Porphyrii (see no. 4), written about 420 by Marcus Diaconus and historically useful in several ways, was formerly known to us only through a very defective Latin version of Gentianus Hervetus († 1584), in *Gallandi,* Bibl. vet. Patr. ix; *Migne,* PG., lxv; the Greek original was edited by *M. Haupt,* in Abhandlungen der k. preuss. Akad. der Wissensch. zu Berlin (1874), pp. 171—215, and separately in 1875. A new edition was brought out by the Sodales societatis philologae Bonnensis, Leipzig, 1875. See *A. Nuth,* De Marci Diaconi Vita Porphyrii episc. Gazensis (Dissert. inaug.), Bonn, 1897. From 395—416 Porphyry had been the bishop of Gaza, once the capital of the Philistines, and after a long and vigorous conflict had dealt a deathblow to the ancient and stubborn heathenism of that city. The deacon Marcus was his inseparable companion and has left us a vivid and reliable narrative of this conflict with dying paganism. No trace has yet been found of the work quoted in c. 88, in which Marcus had collected the proceedings between Porphyry and the female Manichæan, Julia.

17. ACACIUS OF BERŒA. SEVERIANUS OF GABALA. ANTIOCHUS OF PTOLEMAIS. — These three and Theophilus of Alexandria were the four bishops whom Chrysostom refused to accept as his judges (see no. 4). It is probable that Acacius had been deceived by the intrigues of the patriarch's enemies. He was for some fifty years bishop of Beroea (or Aleppo) in Syria and died in 432 at the age of 110 (100?) years. We have from his pen three letters and a profession of faith (*Migne,* PG., lxxvii. 1445 to 1448). Cf. *G. Bickell,* Ausgewählte Gedichte der syrischen Kirchenväter Cyrillonas, Baläus, Isaak von Antiochien und Jakob von Sarug,

Kempten, 1872 (Bibl. der Kirchenväter), pp. 83—89. — Severianus, bishop of Gabala near Laodicea in Syria († post 408), had already abused the confidence of Chrysostom in a very shameful way; cf. *F. Ludwig,* Der hl. Joh. Chrysostomus in seinem Verhältnis zum byzantinischen Hof, Brunsberg, 1883, pp. 51—54. He was well-known as a preacher; Gennadius (De viris ill., c. 21) calls him in homiliis declamator admirabilis. He has left homilies and biblical commentaries (*Gennadius,* l. c.; *Theodoret*, Dial., i ii iii; *Migne,* PG., lxxxiii. 80 210 308); *Cosmas Indicopl.,* Topogr. christ. vii x (*Migne,* PG., lxxxviii. 373 417 ff.). Some of the former are extant, but in the manuscripts are usually attributed to Chrysostom, while external testimonies and internal evidences point to Severianus as their true author. Of the following discourses some are now looked on with certainty, and some with probability, as fragments of his writings Orationes sex in mundi creationem (*Migne,* lvi. 429—500), Oratio de serpente quem Moyses in cruce suspendit (Ib., lvi. 499—516), In illud Abrahae dictum Gen. xxiv. 2 (Ib., lvi. 553—564), De ficu arefacta (Ib., lix. 585—590), Contra Iudaeos (Ib., lxi. 793—802; cf. lxv. 29 f.), De sigillis librorum (Ib., lxiii. 531—544), In Dei apparitionem (Ib., lxv. 15—26), De pace (Ib., lii. 425—428). The latter homily is found in Migne in Latin only and in a fragmentary shape; the original and complete Greek text was edited by *A. Papadopulos-Kerameus,* Ἀνάλεκτα ἱεροσολυμιτικῆς σταχυολογίας, St. Petersburg, 1891, i. 15—26. The Latin homily De pythonibus et maleficiis (*Migne,* PG., lxv. 27—28) is not by Severianus but by St. Peter Chrysologus (cf. *Fr. Liverani,* Spicilegium Liberianum, Florence, 1863, i. 192—193). An ancient Armenian version of 15 homilies under the name of Severianus was published by *Aucher:* Severiani sive Seberiani Gabalorum episc. Emesensis homiliae nunc primum editae, ex antiqua versione armena in latinum sermonem translatae per J. B. Aucher, Venice, 1827. The reader will find there the homilies already mentioned: In illud Abrahae dictum Gen. xxiv. 2, and De ficu arefacta (Hom. 7, 250—293, and Hom. 13, 414—427). The tenth homily in this collection (370—401), on baptism, is the Hom. 13 of St. Basil M., in *Migne,* PG., xxxi. 423—444; cf. § 67, 14. There is in *Pitra,* Analecta sacra et classica, Paris, 1888, part I, 71 f., a little fragment without a title attributed to Severianus; Pitra holds it to be a fragment of his homily Contra haereticos quoted in Sacra Parallela (*Migne,* PG., xcvi. 533). — Antiochus, bishop of Ptolemais (Acco) in Phoenicia, seems to have passed away shortly after the death of St. Chrysostom. His writings have perished (*Gennad.,* De viris ill., c. 20). Quotations from him are found in Theodoret of Cyrus and Leontius of Byzantium (*Migne,* PG., lxxxiii. 205; lxxxvi 1, 1316; lxxxvi 2, 2044).

18. PALLADIUS. ATTICUS OF CONSTANTINOPLE. CONSTANTIUS OF ANTIOCH. — The oft-quoted name of Palladius is found among those of the bishops who refused to communicate with the intruders Arsacius and Atticus, and were compelled to fly from their sees (see no. 5). He is perhaps identical with the Palladius who wrote the Historia Lausiaca (§ 79, 4). His Dialogus de vita S. Ioannis Chrysostomi (*Migne,* PG., xlvii. 5—82), the result of a conversation (about 408) with the Roman deacon Theodore, is looked on as one of the principal sources for the last period of the life of Chrysostom, particularly after his elevation to the patriarchate. The editions of this work and its relative «literature» may be seen in *Fessler-Jungmann,* Institt. Patrol. ii 1, 54 209. — Atticus (see no. 5) died October 10., 425, and is honored as a saint by the Greeks on Jan. 8. Under his name there appear in *Migne,* PG., lxv. 637—652, a *notitia* (from the Acta SS.), a Letter and references to three other Letters; cf. *v. Hefele,* in Wetzer and Welte's Kirchenlexikon, 2. ed., i. 1564—1566. Also *C. Verschaffel,* in

Vacant-Mangenot's Dictionnaire de la Théol. Catholique, Paris, 1903, i. 2220–2221. — Among the 242 letters in the correspondence of Chrysostom (*Migne*, PG., lii; see no. 9) the numbers 237—241, and probably 233, are from his friend Constantius, a priest of Antioch.

### § 75. The so-called Apostolic Constitutions.

1. COMPOSITION. CONTENTS. SOURCES. — «Constitutions of the Holy Apostles» (*διαταγαὶ* or *διατάξεις τῶν ἁγίων ἀποστόλων*) is the name given to a compilation of ecclesiastical law that may be divided into three parts. The first part includes the first six books and is only an enlarged recension of the Didascalia Apostolorum (§ 46). In the details of his work the unknown editor was guided by the nature of the materials that lay before him. While he found no reason to modify seriously the moral prescriptions of the Didascalia, the important changes in ecclesiastical conditions suggested a thorough modification in all that appertained to the constitution, worship, and other interests of the Church. The fiction of apostolic authorship was retained, but it was added that Clement of Rome had sent the work in the name of all the apostles to the bishops and the other priests (vi. 18; cf. the so-called Clementina § 26, 3). The second part of the work is taken up by the seventh book which in its first half (cc. 1—32) is only a paraphrase and enlargement of the Didache (§ 6); in the second half (cc. 33—49) are found various prayer-formulae (cc. 33—38 47—49), rules for the instruction of catechumens and the administration of baptism (cc. 39—45), and a list of the bishops consecrated by the apostles (c. 46). Even in this second half, ancient material has been more or less worked over and adapted. The third and last part of the work, the eighth book, is also its most valuable portion; it is divided into three sections: on the charismata (cc. 1 2), the ecclesiastical orders (cc. 3—26), and the canons (cc. 27—47). The short section on the scope and salutary nature of the *charismata* is probably taken from the *περὶ χαρισμάτων* of Hippolytus (§ 54, 3), a work known to us, however, only by its title. The second section regulates the ordination-services for the various ecclesiastical grades of the clergy, the bishop (cc. 4 5), the priest (c. 16), the deacon (cc. 17 18), the deaconess (cc. 19 20), the sub-deacon (c. 21), the lector (c. 22). As the newly made bishop was obliged to offer up the holy sacrifice immediately after his consecration, the rubrics of the consecration rite are followed by a complete explanation of the liturgy of the Mass (cc. 6—15); finally other ecclesiastical grades are conferred without imposition of hands: they are the confessors (c. 23), the virgins (c. 24), the widows (c. 25), the exorcists (c. 26). In this second section the compiler probably followed the ecclesiastical writings before him less closely than the custom of his own time and province. In the third section which

treats of the ecclesiastical canons, instructions and prayers for divine service, rules for the various ecclesiastical grades, criteria for the examination of proselytes, and regulations for ecclesiastical solemnities are rather promiscuously collected. The collection closes with 85 «ecclesiastical canons of the holy apostles» (c. 47) that correspond, in form, to the ordinary canons of the ancient councils, their contents also reflect the life of the clergy, the manner of its selection and ordination, its morality and official duties. Of these canons 20 are taken from the decrees of the Synod of Antioch, in 341. The last canon enumerates the books of the Old and the New Testament, with the exception of the Apocalypse, but includes among the Catholic Epistles and the Acts of the Apostles «two letters of Clement and the Constitutions *(αἱ διαταγαί)* proposed *(προσπεφωνημέναι)* to you bishops by me, Clement, but which, because of the secret things they contain *(τὰ ἐν αὐταῖς μυστικά)* ought not to be made known to all.»

2. UNITY OF ORIGIN, TIME AND PLACE OF COMPOSITION. — The monograph of Funk (1891) has cast much light not only on the sources but also on the origin of the Apostolic Constitutions. One of his most important discoveries is that from beginning to end the whole work is the product of one hand, and not a compilation from various writings of uncertain and different dates. Apart from the manuscript tradition, the identity of authorship is vouched for by the close connexion of the different parts, the literary relationship of all the books, and various clear indications of identity of time and place of composition. The eighth book, it is true, offers a peculiarity of structure (after the fourth chapter the apostles speak in their own names), but this results from the special nature of the subject-matter that easily falls into separate sentences. The eighth book does contradict in detail certain regulations of the preceding books, but we must remember that from compilations of this kind one cannot demand the perfect unity proper to an independent work. Until lately, the date of compilation, of the first six books at least, was placed about the middle of the fourth century; it was taken for granted that Epiphanius, writing about 375, had known and used at least this portion of the Apostolic Constitutions. But Funk has shown that the expressions of Epiphanius in question[1] refer to the Didascalia Apostolorum and not to the Constitutions of the Apostles. It is clear from internal evidence that the latter were compiled in Syria at the end of the fourth or at the beginning of the fifth century. The chief positive indications of their date are the celebration of Christmas on December 25. (v. 13; viii. 33) and the equalization of the Sabbath with the Sunday as an ecclesiastical holiday (v. 20; vii. 23; viii. 33 47, can. 66). On the other hand, the fact that no knowledge of the Nestorian controversy is shown, hinders

[1] Haer. 45, 4; 70, 10 11 12; 75, 6; 80, 7.

us from assigning the work to a period later than the commencement of the fifth century. That Syria was the home of the compiler appears partly from the Syrian calculation of the months, but still more from the liturgy of the Mass (viii. 6—15), which very much resembles, both in fundamental structure and also in the language of the prayers, the liturgy of Antioch about the year 400, such as it appears e. g. in the works of Chrysostom. Important external testimony confirms the conclusions based on internal evidence: thus, the interpolator of the letters of Saint Ignatius of Antioch not only quotes[1] the Apostolic Constitutions but makes an extensive use of them. Still more: a surprising parallelism both of thought and of diction which occurs, makes it highly probable that this Apollinarist interpolator of Saint Ignatius is also the compiler of the Apostolic Constitutions (§ 9, 1). At the same time he does not seem to have had in view any special purpose; he was content with combining and amplifying ancient ecclesiastical writings.

3. ITS LITERARY HISTORY — The assertion of the compiler was believed; for over a thousand years his work was accepted as the work of the apostles or of Clement writing in their name. The so-called Quinisext Council of the year 692 declared (can. 2) that «the holy synod decrees that the 85 Canons handed down under the name of the holy and venerable apostles shall also in the future remain immutable. In these canons, indeed, it is stated that we must accept their constitutions as drawn up by Clement *(τὰς διὰ Κλήμεντος διατάξεις)*. But because heterodox hands, to the detriment of the Church, have long ago added things spurious and foreign to (Catholic) piety ., we have thought it opportune to reject the afore-said Constitutions». In this way a binding force in the canons was acknowledged while the apostolic origin of the Constitutions was, in a general way, asserted. The influence of the latter, however, was always very slight and almost imperceptible in the Greek Church. Nevertheless, versions and epitomes of them were to be found throughout the Christian East, while in the West, with exception of a part of the canons, they remained utterly unknown throughout the Middle Ages.

4. EDITIONS. VERSIONS. RESEARCHES. — The first edition of the Apostolic Constitutions, and in its way an excellent one, was brought out by *Fr. Turrianus,* Venice, 1563; he also published a Latin version of the work at Antwerp, 1578. Both *Ph. Labbe* (Paris, 1662) and *J. D. Mansi* (Florence, 1759) reprinted the Turrianus edition, each in the first volume of his collection of the councils. Similarly, *J. B. Cotelier,* in the first volume of his edition of the Patres Apostolici (Paris, 1672), has reprinted the Turrianus edition, but added a new Latin version and illustrated the text with a copious commentary in which he made known some variant readings from hitherto unused manuscripts. Other new readings were added by *J. Clericus* in the second of his reprints of the work of *Cotelier,* Amsterdam,

[1] Trall., vii. 3.

1724. It is from the latter two works that the text printed in *Gallandi,* Bibliotheca vet. Patrum, Venice, 1767, iii, and *Migne,* PG., i, Paris, 1857 has been taken (Migne has not the canons of the Apostles). With the aid of the above-mentioned variant readings a new edition was undertaken by *W. Ueltzen,* Constitutiones Apostolicae, Schwerin and Rostock, 1853. We owe to *Bunsen* a recension of the Canons of the Apostles, in Analecta Ante-Nicæna. Collegit, recensuit, illustravit *Chr. C. J. Bunsen,* London, 1854, ii. 1—32. In the same work *P Böttticher (de Lagarde)* edited the eight books of the Apostolic Constitutions, pp. 33—224 339—448 (cf. § 46). Eight years later de Lagarde brought out again the Apostolic Constitutions (without the Canons), in what may be called the first critical edition. Constitutiones Apostolorum. *P A. de Lagarde* edidit, Leipzig and London, 1862. Cardinal *Pitra* published the Apostolic Constitutions in his Iuris ecclesiastici Graecorum Historia et Monumenta, Rome, 1864, i. 110—422, 1—44; but his text-recension is in no way remarkable. The Apostolic Canons (Constit. Apost. viii. 47) were printed so far back as 1531 by *Gr Haloander,* and afterwards incorporated in most editions of the Corpus iuris civilis and the Corpus iuris canonici, also in the greater collections of the councils. They may be found too in *de Lagarde,* Reliquiae iuris eccles. antiquissimae graece, Leipzig, 1856, pp. 20—35, and in *Hefele,* Konziliengeschichte (2. ed.), Freiburg i. Br., 1873, i. 793 to 827. — The first part of the seventh book of the Apostolic Constitutions (cc. 1—32) was also reproduced in various editions of the Didache (§ 6, 4) by *Ph. Bryennios,* Constantinople, 1883; by *A. Harnack,* Leipzig, 1884 1893; by *Ph. Schaff,* New York, 1885 1886 1889; by *Fr. X. Funk,* Tübingen, 1887, and by *J. R. Harris,* Baltimore and London, 1887. — A German version from the Cotelier edition of the Constitutions (with the Canons) was published by *F Boxler,* Kempten, 1874 (Bibliothek der Kirchenväter). — *J. S. v. Drey,* Neue Untersuchungen über die Konstitutionen and Kanones der Apostel, Tübingen, 1832; *Fr. X. Funk,* Die Apostolischen Konstitutionen, Rottenburg, 1891; *Id.,* Das achte Buch der apostolischen Konstitutionen und die verwandten Schriften, Tübingen, 1883, also in Kirchengeschichtl. Abhandlungen und Untersuchungen (1899), ii. 359—372. *A. Baumstark,* Die nichtgriechischen Paralleltexte zum achten Buch der apostolischen Konstitutionen, in Oriens Christianus (1891), i. 98 to 137. *Funk,* Zum achten Buch der apostolischen Konstitut. und den verwandten Schriften, in Theol. Quartalschrift (1902), lxxxiv 223—236; *Id.,* Ein Fragment zu den Apostolischen Konstitutionen, in Theol. Quartalschrift (1903), lxxxv. 195—202. *R. H. Cresswell,* Liturgy of the Eighth Book of the Apostolic Constitutions commonly called the Clementine Liturgy, London, 1900. After his preliminary essays on the subject, *Funk* published a critical edition, vol. i: Didascalia et Constitutiones Apostolorum: vol. ii: Testimonia et Scripturae propinquae, Paderborn, 1905, which bids fair to remain the standard one. The Greek text of the Didascalia is not extant. Funk gives a new Latin translation of the Syriac version of the Didascalia and adds the lectiones variantes of the Oriental versions of the Didascalia, as well as those of the Greek text of the Constitution.

5. DIDASCALIA ARABICA AND ÆTHIOPICA. — There is extant, in an Arabic and an Ethiopic version, a later recension of the first six books of the Apostolic Constitutions, really an interpolated Didascalia; in these versions the latter title is sometimes corrupted into «Dascalia». The greater part of the Ethiopic version has been printed; of the Arabic only fragments have seen the light, partly in

Arabic, partly in German. It seems certain that the Ethiopic text comes from the Arabic, not immediately, but by means of a Coptic version of the latter. Most of the manuscripts of the Arabic version contain five chapters (35—39) that are found also in the «Testament of Our Lord» (see no. 7), whence they were certainly borrowed. They treat of the bishop, his election, ordination, consecration, and his duties of prayer and fasting.

The Ethiopic Didascalia was edited and translated into English as far as c. 22 (i. e. as far as Const. Apost. iv. 13) by *Th. Pell Platt,* The Ethiopic Didascalia, London, 1834. The Ethiopic text is preceded (pp. xiii—xiv) by the introduction to the Arabic text and the first chapter of the same (without translation). With the help of Socin, a German version of the introduction, the chapters immediately following, the table of contents, and chapters 35—39 of the Arabic text, were published by *Fr. X. Funk,* Die Apostolischen Konstitutionen, Rottenburg, 1891, pp. 207—242. Cf. *A. Baumstark,* in Röm. Quartalschr. (1900), xiv. 12 f.

6. THE EIGHTH BOOK OF THE APOSTOLIC CONSTITUTIONS. THE «CONSTITUTIONES PER HIPPOLYTUM». THE EGYPTIAN CHURCH-ORDINANCE. — What is known as the «Constitutiones per Hippolytum» exists only in fragmentary shape; with the exception of a few passages, it corresponds verbally with a considerable part of the eighth book of the Apostolic Constitutions. Each of its five fragments bears a special title: *διδασκαλία τῶν ἁγίων ἀποστόλων περὶ χαρισμάτων* (Const. Ap. viii. 1—2), *διατάξεις τῶν αὐτῶν ἁγίων ἀποστόλων περὶ χειροτονιῶν διὰ Ἱππολύτου* (Const. Ap. viii. 4—5 16—18 30—31), *Παύλου τοῦ ἁγίου ἀποστόλου διατάξεις περὶ κανόνων ἐκκλησιαστικῶν* (Const. Ap. viii. 32), *Πέτρου καὶ Παύλου τῶν ἁγίων ἀποστόλων διατάξεις* (Const. Ap. viii. 33—34 42—45), *περὶ εὐταξίας διδασκαλία πάντων τῶν ἁγίων ἀποστόλων* (Const. Ap. viii. 46). Hence, it is only the title of the second fragment, «On ordinations», that contains the words *διὰ Ἱππολύτου*, thereby pretending to be the work of Hippolytus of Rome, for there can be no question of another Hippolytus. The whole work, however, is clearly nothing more than an epitome of the eighth book of the Apostolic Constitutions, and is done, too, so carelessly that the writer has preserved the four references in the eighth book to preceding books of the Constitutions. Achelis and Harnack maintain that the writer made use, not of the eighth book of the Apostolic Constitutions, but of an older and closely related work, which they suppose to have been also the model and source of the Constitutions, but their thesis rests on no solid foundation, and Funk has shown that it offers many difficulties and irreconcilable contradictions. «Egyptian Church-Ordinance» is the name given by Achelis (1891) to the second part of an archaic *Corpus iuris canonici,* that opens with the Apostolic Church-Ordinance (§ 42). The latter includes thirty canons, while the Egyptian Church-Ordinance contains more (31—62). By reason of its reception into the afore-mentioned canonic-

al collection the Egyptian Church-Ordinance has reached us in several Oriental versions or recensions: Coptic, Ethiopic, and Arabic. The original Greek text is apparently lost. On the other hand, fragments of a Latin version, more faithful and trustworthy than the Oriental versions, have lately been discovered. The original title was probably: Canones sanctorum apostolorum per Hippolytum. The work treats of ordinations and ecclesiastical grades, proselytes and catechumens, women, baptism, fasting, the Agape and the Blessed Eucharist, oblations, church services, urials, band times of prayer. The first third of these canons (31—42) corresponds substantially with cc. 4—32 of the eighth book of the Apostolic Constitutions; and some even of the other canons are found in the same eighth book. The canons differ, however, in some details from the Apostolic Constitutions, but on such occasions they are found to agree with the *Constitutiones per Hippolytum*. Throughout the work there is evident a tendency to condensation that betrays the intention of the writer to abbreviate, for which reason and others as well Funk sees in the Constitutiones per Hippolytum the basis of the Egyptian Church-Ordinance: if the former are to be dated about 425, the latter must be referred to about 450 Achelis and Harnack reverse this order of dependency; according to them the shorter text (Egyptian Church-Ordinance) is the older one and was compiled about the year 300, while the Constitutiones per Hippolytum belong, approximately, to the year 390.

The «Constitutiones per Hippolytum» are printed in the editions of Hippolytus by *J. A. Fabricius,* Hamburg, 1716—1718; *A. Gallandi,* Venice, 1766 (Bibl. vet. Patr. ii); *P. de Lagarde,* Leipzig and London, 1858. They are also found in *de Lagarde,* Reliquiae iuris eccl. antiquissimae graece, Leipzig, 1856, pp. 1—18, and in *Pitra,* Iuris eccles. Graecorum historia et monumenta, Rome, 1864, i. 45—75. — The first three canons of the Ethiopic recension of the Egyptian Church-Ordinance were published by *J. Ludolfus,* Ad suam historiam Aethiopicam antehac editam commentarius, Frankfort, 1691, pp. 323—328; he also added a Latin version of them.

A German version of the Ethiopic text (according to *Ludolf*) was made by *J. Bachmann,* and is found in *H. Achelis,* Die ältesten Quellen des orientalischen Kirchenrechts, Leipzig, 1891, i. 39 ff. The North-Egyptian (Memphitic, Bohiric) recension of the Egyptian Church-Ordinance was published (with an English translation) by *H. Tattam,* The Apostolical Constitutions, London, 1848, pp. 31—92. *Bötticher (de Lagarde)* undertook to re-translate into Greek the Coptic text of *Tattam,* in *Bunsen,* Analecta Ante-Nicæna, London, 1854, ii. 461—477. The South-Egyptian (Theban, Sahidic) text, whence the North-Egyptian text is derived, was edited by *de Lagarde,* Aegyptiaca, Göttingen, 1883, pp. 248—266 (without a translation), and by *U. Bouriant,* in Recueil de travaux relatifs à la philol. et à l'archéol. égypt. et assyr., Paris, 1883—1884, v. 206—216 (without a translation). A German version of the South-Egyptian recension was made, from the edition of de Lagarde, by *G. Steindorff,* and is found in *Achelis,* l. c., 39 ff. In the Theol. Quartalschrift (1893), lxxv. 664—666, *Funk* published a brief fragment of the original Greek of the

Egyptian Church-Ordinance (canon 47 in Coptic). The fragments of a Latin version are in *E. Hauler,* Didascaliae apostolorum fragmenta Veronensia Latina, Leipzig, 1900, i. 101—121. — *H. Achelis,* Die ältesten Quellen des orientalischen Kirchenrechtes, i: Die «Canones Hippolyti», Leipzig, 1891, in Texte und Untersuchungen, new series, vi. 4. *Id.,* in Zeitschr. f. Kirchengesch. (1894—1895), xv. 1—43. Cf. *Harnack,* in Theol. Studien u. Kritiken (1893), lxvi. 403—420. On the other side see *Funk,* Die Apostolischen Konstitutionen, Rottenburg, 1891, pp. 142—150 253 to 280. *Id.,* Das achte Buch der Apostolischen Konstitutionen und die verwandten Schriften, Tübingen, 1893 (against Harnack). *Id.,* in Hist. Jahrbuch (1895), xvi. 1—36 473—509 (against Achelis). *Id.,* Das Testament unseres Herrn und die verwandten Schriften, Mainz, 1901. The order of the dependency established by Achelis is defended by *H. de Jongh,* Le Testament de Notre Seigneur et les écrits apparentés, in Revue d'hist. ecclés. (1902), iii. 615– 643. He writes, however, independently concerning the actual date and origin of the various texts in question. *G. Horner,* The Statutes of the Apostles or Canones Ecclesiastici; cf. *Funk,* Theol. Quartalschrift (1906), pp. 1—27. *F. Nau,* «Constitutions Apostoliques», in the Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique, Paris, 1907 (1520—1536). *Id.,* «Canons Apostoliques», ib. (1605—1626).

7. THE EIGHTH BOOK OF THE APOSTOLIC CONSTITUTIONS (CONTINUED). THE TESTAMENT OF OUR LORD. THE CANONS OF HIPPOLYTUS. — Through the medium of the Egyptian Church-Ordinance two other works are affiliated to the eighth book of the Apostolic Constitutions. The Testament of our Lord Jesus Christ, composed originally in Greek, has reached us in Syriac, Ethiopic, and Arabic versions; short Latin fragments of the introduction are also extant. The complete Syriac text was edited in 1899 by the Syrian patriarch Rahmani; de Lagarde had already made known (1856) some scattered fragments of the work. The introduction contains prophecies of our Lord concerning the last days, and probably was at first an independent work. It is followed by a very lengthy ecclesiastical ordinance, placed also in the mouth of our Lord, and by an exposition of the liturgy. There is a close and substantial parallelism between the verbose text of this Church-Ordinance or «Testament» and the more compact text of the Egyptian Church-Ordinance. From this Rahmani concluded that the «Testament» was older than the Egyptian text, the latter being an excerpt from the former; the «Testament» could be dated back to the second century, while the Egyptian Church-Ordinance would belong to the third century. These conclusions have been universally rejected. Funk has shown, by an exhaustive research, that the «Testament» is an amplification, and that the Egyptian Church-Ordinance is no compendium. The latter cannot have been compiled in the third century, and the former exhibits abundant evidence, constitutional, liturgical and dogmatic, of a later ecclesiastical period. There is mention of this «Testament» in a Greek theosophy of the end of the fifth century (*διαθήκης τινὸς τοῦ κυρίου*); so it may have been written about 475 in some circle of Syrian Mono-

physites. The *Canones Hippolyti* have reached us in an Arabic and an Ethiopic version. The former was published in 1870 by von Haneberg and in 1890 by Riedel. The contents of this work are so similar to those of the Egyptian Church-Ordinance that the one is certainly a recension of the other. According to Achelis the priority belongs to the Canons of Hippolytus. He recognizes in the Arabic version numerous later additions and transformations, but maintains that the original Greek text was the work of Hippolytus of Rome, about 218—221. Funk holds the priority of the Egyptian Church-Ordinance: the Canons of Hippolytus were constructed from this document, and they did not appear before the end of the fifth century, in the East at least: the arguments of Funk seem quite irresistible. More or less conclusive arguments against the authorship of Hippolytus are found in all the passages that Achelis inclines to consider as later additions; they form about one third of the entire work. As the latter stands in the manuscripts, it is clearly of Oriental origin and cannot have been compiled before the end of the fifth century. The Canones Hippolyti cannot be the source and foundation of the Egyptian Church-Ordinance, because in the former work there is wanting in the suitable place (can. 2) a reference to earlier matter that the compiler of the Egyptian Church-Ordinance makes in his thirty-first canon. Indeed, the Canones Hippolyti assert quite expressly that they are a recension of the Apostolic Constitutions: hi sunt — the text begins thus — canones ecclesiae et praecepta quae scripsit Hippolytus, princeps episcoporum Romanorum, secundum mandata apostolorum.

The Syriac version of the «Testament» was published, with a Latin translation, by Ignatius Ephraem II. Rahmani, patriarch of Antioch, Mainz, 1899; fragments of it had been previously edited by *de Lagarde,* Reliquiae iuris eccles. antiquissimae, Leipzig, 1856, pp. 2—19 (Syriac), pp. 80—89 (Greek text, i. e. a re-translation from Syriac into Greek). Two short fragments of a Latin version of the introduction to the «Testament» were published by *M. Rh. James,* Apocrypha anecdota, Cambridge, 1893, in Texts and Studies, ii 3, 151—154. For details concerning the manuscript tradition of the work cf. *Baumstark,* in Röm. Quartalschr. (1900), xiv. 1—45; the Arabic texts are also treated ib., pp. 291—300. — See *v. Funk,* Das Testament unseres Herrn und die verwandten Schriften, Mainz, 1901, in Forschungen zur christlichen Literatur- und Dogmengeschichte, ii. 1—2; cf. *Harnack,* in Sitzungsberichte der k. preuss. Akademie der Wissenschaft, Berlin, 1899, pp. 878—891; *G. Morin,* in Revue Bénéd. (1900), xvii. 10—28; *P. Batiffol,* in Revue Bibl. (1900), ix. 253—260. For other studies see *Funk,* l. c. Text-Studies on the work were published by *J. P. Arendzen,* A new syriac Text of the apocalyptic part of the «Testamentum» of the Lord, in Journal of Theol. Studies (1901), ii. 401—416; *F. Nau,* Fragment inédit d'une traduction jusqu'ici inconnue du Testamentum Domini nostri Iesu Christi, Paris, 1901. A passage of this version suggests that the apocalyptic fragment was written about 351. *L. Guerrier,* Le Testament de N. S. Jésus Christ. Essai sur la partie apocalypsique (Thèse), Lyon, 1903. *U. Benigni,* L'Apocalisse del Testamentum Domini, in Bes-

sarione (1900—1901), iv, vol. vii. 33—41; cf. *Funk*, in Theol. Quartalschr. (1902), lxxxiv. 159—160 223—236, and *H. de Jongh*, in Revue d'hist. ecclés. (1902), iii. 615—643. *J. Cooper* and *A. J. Maclean*, The Testament of Our Lord translated into English from Syriac. With Introduction and Notes, Edinburg, 1902. — The Canones Hippolyti were edited in Arabic and Latin by *D. B. v. Haneberg*, Munich, 1870; his version was revised from the Arabic by *H. Vielhaber* and *L. Stern*, and reprinted in *Achelis*, Die ältesten Quellen des orientalischen Kirchenrechtes (1891), i. 38 ff. The Latin text of Haneberg is in *L. Duchesne*, Origines du culte chrétien, 2. ed., Paris, 1898, pp. 505—521. *F C. Burkitt*, On the Baptismal Rite in the Canons of Hippolytus, in Journal of Theol. Studies (1900), i. 279.

Other Arabic manuscripts were used for the German translation of the Canones by *W. Riedel*, Die Kirchenrechtsquellen des Patriarchats Alexandrien, Leipzig, 1900, pp. 193—230; his work is, therefore, in some sense equivalent to a new edition of the Arabic text. The most important works on the Canones Hippolyti are mentioned immediately above no. 6. The following offer a special value: *Funk*, Das Testament unseres Herrn, pp. 213—291; *de Jongh*, l. c.; *Funk*, Das Osterfasten und die Canones Hippolyti, in Theol. Quartalschr. (1901), lxxxiii. 639—640; *A. Baumstark*, Kanones des Hippolytos oder Kanones des Julius, in Oriens Christianus (1952), ii. 191—196; *J. P. Arendzen*, The XXXII[d] Canon of Hippolytus, in Journal of Theolog. Studies (1902—1903), iv 282—285; *W. Riedel*, Bemerkungen zu den Canones des Hippolytus, in Theol. Studien u. Krit. (1903), lxxvi. 338—342.

8. RECENSIONS OF THE APOSTOLIC CANONS. — Towards the year 500, Dionysius Exiguus translated into Latin the first fifty of the eighty-five Apostolic Canons with which the Apostolic Constitutions end (viii. 47); they were placed by him at the beginning of his collection of ancient canons. There is no reason to doubt that Dionysius took them immediately from the Apostolic Constitutions or that he was acquainted with all eighty-five canons. Gradually these fifty canons translated by Dionysius acquired juridical authority in the Latin Church; Pseudo-Isidore made a place for them in his collection, and Gratian certainly incorporated in his *Decretum* some extracts from them. — At the end of the above-mentioned Corpus iuris canonici of different Egyptian Churches (see no. 6) there is also found a recension of the Apostolic Canons. The various recensions of this canonical collection differ both as to the number and the form of the Canons; frequently several canons of the Greek text are welded into one canon. Also two Syriac translations of the Apostolic Canons, quite identical with the Greek text, have been published.

For Dionysius Exiguus and his collections of canons cf. § 114, 3. His version of the fifty Apostolic Canons is usually printed with the Greek text of the same (see no. 4) also in *Hefele*, l. c., pp. 800—816. Dionysius made another version of the Apostolic Canons, that remained long unedited, until it was published, together with the Vulgata and another recension of the same, by *C. H. Turner*, Ecclesiae Occidentalis monumenta iuris antiquissima, Oxford, 1899, i. 1—32. — The North-Egyptian text of the Apostolic Canons, 85 in number as in the Greek, is found in

*Tattam,* l. c. (see no. 6), with an English version, pp. 173—214; the South-Egyptian text (71 canons) together with the North-Egyptian is in *de Lagarde,* Aegyptiaca, pp. 209—238, and (without the North-Egyptian) in *Bouriant,* l. c., Paris, 1885, vi. 109—115 (both untranslated). The Ethiopic text (57 canons), with a Latin version, may be seen in *W. Fell,* Canones Apostolorum aethiopice (Diss. inaug.), Leipzig, 1871. For a Syriac text (83 canons) with a Latin version cf. *A. Mai,* Script. vet. nova coll. (1838), x 1, 175—184, 8—17 Another Syriac text (82 canons, untranslated) is in *de Lagarde,* Reliquiae iuris eccles. antiquissimae syriace (1856), pp. 44—60.

### § 76. Synesius of Cyrene.

1. HIS LIFE. — Synesius was born between 370 and 375, at Cyrene in Libyan Pentapolis, the so-called Cyrenaica, of an ancient and noble family that still clung to its ancestral paganism. With his brother Euoptius he betook himself to Alexandria, the seat of all higher studies in Egypt. There he became acquainted with the gifted Hypatia, the intellectual daughter of the mathematician Theon, and by her was initiated into the mysteries of the Neo-Platonist (Plotinist) philosophy On his return to his native town, though still quite a young man, the oppressed cities of the Pentapolis sent him (397) to the imperial court as their representative, in the hope that he might obtain a remittal of the excessive taxes levied on them. He returned successful in 400, and thenceforth lived chiefly for his beloved study of philosophy. In 409 the clergy and people of Ptolemais requested him to become their bishop and metropolitan of the Pentapolis, though he does not seem to have been at the time a Christian. The entire region, threatened by the marauding hordes of barbarians (Macheti), placed its sole hope in this youthful descendant of an estimable patrician family, who had already given evidence of good abilities. He was consecrated by Theophilus, patriarch of Alexandria, but on two conditions, viz. that he should not be compelled to dismiss his wife, and should not be forced to abandon his philosophical opinions, some of which were not consistent with ecclesiastical teaching, e. g. the pre-existence of the soul, the eternity of creation, the allegorical concept of resurrection (cf. his letter to Euoptius, n. 105). His mental attitude and dispositions do not seem to have been at any time fully Christian. The points of contact between Platonism and Christianity obscured in his mind the antithesis of their fundamental principles. He was a Christian at heart, but in the things of the mind remained a follower of Plato. Nevertheless, as a bishop he stood out manfully and successfully, amid difficult circumstances, for justice and peace. His career was not destined to be a long one; his letters exhibit no date later than 413. With his eloquent discourse the history of the Libyan Pentapolis comes to an end; even now it is his writings that act as our guide in the labyrinth of grandiose monuments that continue to arouse the admiration of the traveller in the Pentapolis.

2. WRITINGS OF SYNESIUS. — There are three distinct periods, as Kraus has well shown, in the mental development and the literary labors of this distinguished man. To the first period belong those of his writings[1] that are especially heathen and Platonic and exhibit nothing that is pronouncedly Christian. They are the discourse on Royalty *(περὶ βασιλείας)*, a manly speech made in 399 at Constantinople in presence of the emperor Arcadius; the little work *ὑπὲρ τοῦ δώρου ἀστρολαβίου*, which he dedicated to a certain Pæonius at Constantinople with the gift of a fine astrolabe, the Egyptian discourses on Providence *(Αἰγύπτιοι λόγοι ἢ περὶ προνοίας)*, begun at Constantinople but finished in Egypt, in which under the native myth of Osiris and Typhos he described the conditions and events at the imperial capital; the praise of Baldness *(φαλάκρας ἐγκώμιον)*, a satire on those sophists who speak for no higher purpose than the pleasure of speech, Dio or a life ordered according to him *(Δίων ἢ περὶ τῆς κατ' αὐτὸν διαγωγῆς)*, a defence of the scientific occupations of the author, as justified by the life of the philosopher and rhetorician Dio Chrysostomus, the tractate on the causes and meaning of dreams *(περὶ ἐνυπνίων)*; some hymns and a collection of letters. The latter number 156 (in Migne), and have always aroused a lively interest, partly because of the perfection of their style and partly because they are a rich source of information concerning the history and the geography of the Pentapolis. They seem to have been written between 399 and 413. The ten hymns, preserved to us, are all in the Doric dialect and composed according to the laws of ancient prosody The first four, lyrical outpourings of a profoundly religious soul, belong probably to the first period of his life. Some other hymns point to a period of transition, perhaps from 404 to 409; in these writings the author seems to waver between Christianity and paganism. No important work, however, belongs to this period. From his consecration to the see of Ptolemais dates a third period of his life in which the Christian element is uppermost, though the pagan thought and sentiment are not quite overcome. Many of his letters belong to this period, also two (fragmentary) homilies, and two orations *(καταστάσεις)*. The first of these orations is a splendid example of eloquence, descriptive of the renewed invasion of the Pentapolis (411) by the barbarians; the second is a panegyric of Anysius, the prefect (dux) of Pentapolis. To this period also must be referred the composition of the seventh or eighth hymn which is specifically Christian in character.

3. LITERATURE ON SYNESIUS. — A complete edition of his writings, with Latin translation and notes, was made by *Dionysius Petavius,* Paris, 1612 1631 1633 and 1640 (the best). A new edition of the hymns was brought out by *J. Fr. Boissonade,* Paris, 1825 (Poetarum graecorum sylloge xv:

[1] *Migne,* PG., lxvi.

Lyrici graeci, pp. 97—160). *J. G. Krabinger* collated many codices for a new edition of Synesius; he published editions of several writings: the discourse on Royalty, Munich, 1825; the praise of Baldness, Stuttgart, 1834; the Egyptian discourses, Sulzbach, 1835, all three with German versions. A complete edition was begun by *Krabinger*, but only the first volume appeared, Landshut, 1850; it contains the Greek text with a simple critical apparatus of the longer works (except the letters and hymns). The *Petavius* edition (1633) is reprinted in *Migne*, PG., lxvi, Paris, 1859 1864, though the text of the praise of Baldness is taken from the *Krabinger* edition. For a new edition of the letters of Synesius cf. *R. Hercher*, Epistolographi graeci, Paris, 1873, pp. 638—739. New editions of the ten hymns were brought out by *W Christ* and *M. Paranikas*, Leipzig, 1871 (Anthologia graeca carminum christianorum, Leipzig, 1871, pp. 3—23; cf. Proleg. pp. ix—xii), and *J. Flach*, Tübingen, 1875. *E. Gaiser*, Des Synesius von Cyrene ägyptische Erzählungen oder über die Vorsehung, Wolfenbüttel, 1886 (Inaug.-Diss.). *O. Seek*, Studien zu Synesios, I. Der historische Gehalt des Osirismythos. II. Die Briefsammlung· Philologus (1893), lii. 442—483. *W Fritz*, Die Briefe des Bischofs Synesius von Kyrene, Leipzig, 1898. *Fr. X. Kraus*, Studien über Synesios von Cyrene, in Theol. Quartalschr. (1865), xlvii. 381—448 537—600; (1866), xlviii. 85—129. *R. Volkmann*, Synesius von Cyrene, Berlin, 1869. *E. Gaiser*, Synesius von Cyrene, in Theol. Studien aus Württemberg (1886), vii. 51—70. *C. M. Dreves*, Der Sänger der Kyrenaika, in Stimmen aus Maria-Laach (1897), lii. 545—562. *J. R. Asmus*, Synesius und Dio Chrysostomus, in Byzantin. Zeitschr. (1900), ix. 85—151; *W S. Crawford*, Synesius the Hellen, London, 1901; *A. J. Kleffner*, Synesius von Cyrene, der Philosoph und Dichter, und sein angeblicher Vorbehalt bei seiner Wahl und Weihe zum Bischof von Ptolemais, Paderborn, 1901. *H. Koch*, Synesius von Cyrene bei seiner Wahl und Weihe zum Bischof, in Hist. Jahrbuch (1902), xxiii. 751—774. *C. Valley*, Etude sur les hymnes de Synésius de Cyrène, Paris, 1905.

### § 77. St. Cyril of Alexandria.

1. HIS LIFE BEFORE 428. — We know but little concerning St. Cyril before his elevation to the patriarchal see of Alexandria, in 412. He was probably born in that city and was a nephew of its patriarch Theophilus. His extensive theological knowledge was certainly acquired in its Christian schools. From the four very frank letters of St. Isidore Pelusiota to the patriarch Cyril[1] we learn that Cyril lived for a time in the desert with the monks and received from them a training in Christian ascetism. He went with his uncle to Constantinople in 403, and took part in the «Synod of the Oak» near Chalcedon at which Chrysostom was deposed (§ 74, 4). Theophilus died October 15., 412, and two days afterwards Cyril was elected patriarch, but not without opposition. We know but little of the beginnings of his administration, and that little is colored by the partisan temper of the narrative of Socrates[2] — The youthful patriarch's treatment of the Novatians and the Jews of Alexandria may have been characterized by a certain precipitation and a want of feeling[3].

[1] *S. Isid. Pel.*, Ep. i. 310 323 324 370. [2] Hist. eccl., vii. 7 11 13 ff.
[3] Cf. the relative Letters of Isidore.

It is impossible to obtain a clear knowledge of the dissensions between Cyril and the imperial city-prefect Orestes at Alexandria, Socrates insinuates[1], without proof, that the patriarch was responsible for the murder by the Christians (March, 415) of the female philosopher Hypatia, a close friend of the prefect. It was only after a long resistance that Cyril caused (about 417) the name of St. Chrysostom to be replaced in the diptychs of the Alexandrian church. After 429 the sources of our information multiply; thenceforth Cyril is a prominent factor in the great problems of ecclesiastical and dogmatical history. Amid perils and trials his spirit and character shine as in a noonday splendor and exhibit in him an instrument specially chosen by God.

2. THE CONFLICT WITH NESTORIANISM. — In 428 Nestorius became bishop of Constantinople, and at once began to disseminate by means of his sermons the Christological teaching of Diodorus of Tarsus (§ 72, 3) and Theodore of Mopsuestia (§ 73, 3). He denied the unity of person in Christ, asserted that the Blessed Virgin could not be called Mother of God *(θεοτόκος)* and that to speak of a God in swaddling clothes and crucified was only a heathen fable. As early as the spring of 429 Cyril gave a general reply to these false theses and defended the orthodox teaching in his Festal Letter of Easter of that year and in an Encyclical Letter to the monks of Egypt. It was not the divine nature, but the Incarnate Word that was born of Mary; the human nature in Christ does not belong to any human person but to the Divine Word. After fruitless efforts to arrive at an understanding, both Cyril and Nestorius appealed to pope Celestine, with the result that at a Roman synod, held in 430, Nestorius was declared a heretic and threatened with deposition unless within ten days from the receipt of the synodal decision he retracted his errors. Cyril was charged with the duty of communicating this decision to Nestorius and, in the name of the pope, of excommunicating him, in case he proved rebellious; he added to the pope's letter a profession of faith approved by an Alexandrine synod of 430, in which he developed more fully the doctrine that Nestorius was to accept, and also twelve «anathematisms» that described the errors which Nestorius was to reject. Nestorius replied with twelve counter-anathematisms, and by that the rupture was completed. Some days before the reception of Cyril's anathematisms at Constantinople, the emperor Theodosius had yielded to the instances of Nestorius and convoked (Nov. 19., 430) a council at Ephesus for the Pentecost of 431. The pope delegated Cyril as his representative. In its first session (June 22., 431), the council deposed Nestorius and confirmed both the profession of faith and the twelve anathematisms of Cyril.

[1] Hist. eccl., vii. 15.

Throughout its sessions the latter was the soul of the council, and fulfilled his mission, amid many difficulties, with prudence, courage and perseverance. The bishops of the Antiochene province, under the leadership of John of Antioch, had separated from Cyril and the other bishops, and taken part more or less openly with Nestorius. It was not until 433 that a reconciliation was effected: in that year Cyril signed a profession of faith (very probably drawn up by Theodoret of Cyrus, the most learned of the Antiochenes) that was capable of an orthodox interpretation and acknowledged in particular the divine maternity of the Blessed Virgin. Although in this manner a schism was formally avoided, Cyril was obliged to devote the remainder of his days to its final extermination. His death took place June 27., 444. If we except Athanasius, none of the other Greek Fathers exercised so far-reaching an influence on ecclesiastical doctrine as Cyril; and if we except Augustine, there is none among all the other Fathers whose works have been adopted so extensively by ecumenical councils as a standard expression of Christian faith.

3. HIS APOLOGY AGAINST JULIAN. — We may place first among his writings the work «For the holy religion of the Christians against the books of the impious Julian» *(ὑπὲρ τῆς τῶν Χριστιανῶν εὐαγοῦς θρησκείας πρὸς τὰ τοῦ ἐν ἀθέοις Ἰουλιανοῦ)*[1], composed in 433 and dedicated to Theodosius II. The three books of Julian «Against the Galilæans» (of the years 362—363) must have been still very popular in anti-Christian circles. It is probable that the work of Cyril originally included thirty books; only the first ten have reached us entire, while of books xi—xx only Greek and Syriac fragments have been preserved. The first ten books are a reply to the first book of Julian and deal with the relations of Judaism to heathenism, and of Christianity to both Judaism and heathenism. Julian asserted that Christianity was only a debased Judaism with an admixture of heathenism. Cyril follows his adversary step by step, and always places before the reader the text of Julian's own arguments; Cyril's work is, therefore, the principal source of our knowledge concerning the (lost) anti-Christian work of the unfortunate emperor. In this work, as elsewhere, Cyril lays more stress on precision of statement and closeness of argument than on fluency and elegancy of diction.

4. DOGMATICO-POLEMICAL WRITINGS. — The polemical note dominates in all his dogmatic writings. The earliest of them are his two great works on the Trinity: *ἡ βίβλος τῶν θησαυρῶν περὶ τῆς ἁγίας καὶ ὁμοουσίου τριάδος*[2], in 35 theses (*λόγοι*, assertiones), and *περὶ ἁγίας τε καὶ ὁμοουσίου τριάδος*[3] in the form of seven dialogues (*λόγοι*, dialogi) of the author with his friend Hermias. Both works were written against the Arians, and treat principally of the true divinity

[1] *Migne,* PG., lxxvi. 503—1064. [2] Ib., lxxv. 9—656.
[3] Ib., lxxv. 657—1124.

of the Son. When compared with the later Christological writings of Cyril they exhibit a certain imperfection and obscurity in the concept and exposition of the doctrine of the union of the two natures in Christ. A brief and popular work on the Trinity (*περὶ τῆς ἁγίας καὶ ζωοποιοῦ τριάδος*)[1], first edited by Cardinal Mai, is regarded as spurious. It is clearly the first part of a larger work, the second part of which treated of the Incarnation and which was also discovered by Mai: *περὶ τῆς τοῦ κυρίου ἐνανθρωπήσεως*[2]. Ehrhard has shown (1888) that it is the work of Theodoret of Cyrus. Shortly after the beginning of the Nestorian conflict, 429—430, Cyril remitted to the imperial court three memorials on the true faith: *προσφωνητικοὶ περὶ τῆς ὀρθῆς πίστεως*, the first of which was addressed to the emperor Theodosius II.[3], the second to his two younger sisters Arcadia and Marina[4], and the third to Pulcheria, the elder sister of the emperor, and to his wife Eudocia[5]. To the same period belongs the work against the blasphemies of Nestorius: *κατὰ τῶν Νεστορίου δυσφημιῶν πεντάβιβλος ἀντίῤῥησις*[6], in five books, directed against a collection of the heresiarch's sermons, and distinguished for solidity of argumentation and cutting sarcasm. The twelve «Anathematisms» of 430 were defended by Cyril in an «apology» against the attacks of the oriental, i. e. the Syrian, bishops: *ἀπολογητικὸς ὑπὲρ τῶν δώδεκα κεφαλαίων πρὸς τοὺς τῆς ἀνατολῆς ἐπισκόπους*[7]; in a rejoinder to the reply of Theodoret of Cyrus: *ἐπιστολὴ πρὸς Εὐόπτιον πρὸς τὴν παρὰ Θεοδωρίτου κατὰ τῶν δώδεκα κεφαλαίων ἀντίῤῥησιν*[8]; and in a brief commentary: *ἐπίλυσις τῶν δώδεκα κεφαλαίων*[9], which was written in 431 during his imprisonment at Ephesus. Immediately after the council he justified his actions, both before and during its sessions, in an «apology» to the emperor Theodosius: *λόγος ἀπολογητικὸς*[10]. He wrote also on the Incarnation of the Divine Word: *περὶ τῆς ἐνανθρωπήσεως τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου*[11]; on the unity of person in Christ: *ὅτι εἷς ὁ Χριστός*[12]; the treatises (first edited by Mai) against Nestorius: *διάλεξις πρὸς Νεστόριον*[13], and against those who do not acknowledge Mary to be the Mother of God: *κατὰ τῶν μὴ βουλομένων ὁμολογεῖν θεοτόκον τὴν ἁγίαν παρθένον*[14], and finally and especially the so-called *Scholia de Incarnatione Unigeniti: περὶ τῆς ἐνανθρωπήσεως τοῦ μονογενοῦς*[15], highly prized in antiquity but now extant for the most part only in a Latin version. The dialogue on the Incarnation of the Only-begotten[16] is but another

[1] Ib., lxxv. 1147—1190.
[2] Ib , lxxv. 1419—1478, see only the beginning of this writing.
[3] Ib., lxxvi. 1133—1200.
[4] Ib , lxxvi. 1201—1336.
[5] Ib., lxxvi. 1335—1420.
[6] Ib., lxxvi. 9—248.
[7] Ib , lxxvi. 315—386.
[8] Ib., lxxvi. 385—452.
[9] Ib., lxxvi. 293—312.
[10] Ib., lxxvi. 453—488.
[11] Ib., lxxv. 1413—1420.
[12] Ib., lxxv. 1253—1362.
[13] Ib., lxxvi. 249—256.
[14] Ib., lxxv. 255—292.
[15] Ib., lxxv. 1369—1412.
[16] Ib., lxxv. 1189—1254.

edition of his treatise on the true faith addressed to Theodosius. The genuineness of the work against the Anthropomorphites: *κατὰ ἀνθρωπομορφιτῶν*[1], or those who attributed to God a human figure, is denied, and justly so. Many of his dogmatico-polemical works have perished. He wrote one book against the Synousiasts (Apollinarists), three books against Theodore of Mopsuestia and Diodorus of Tarsus (§ 72, 3), one book on the true faith, and other writings, of which only fragments have reached us[2]. Photius gives a brief summary[3] of a work written by Cyril against the Pelagians and addressed to the emperor Theodosius II.

5. EXEGETICAL WRITINGS. — In the complete editions of his writings the exegetical works take up the greater part of the volumes. The 17 books on the adoration and worship of God in spirit and in truth: *περὶ τῆς ἐν πνεύματι καὶ ἀληθείᾳ προσκυνήσεως καὶ λατρείας*[4], undertake to prove that the law was abrogated only in the letter and not in the spirit, and that spiritual adoration was typically prefigured in the institutions of the Old Testament. This work is completed by the thirteen books of «elegant comments»: *γλαφυρά*[5], devoted to a typical exposition of select Pentateuch passages. He wrote detailed and continuous commentaries on Isaias[6], and on the twelve minor prophets[7] There are also extant fragments or *catenae-scholia* on the books of Kings[8], on Psalms[9], on some Canticles, on Proverbs, and the Canticle of canticles[10], and on the prophets Jeremias, Baruch, Ezechiel, Daniel[11] He wrote also on the New Testament; and among other works, a large and valuable commentary on the Gospel of St. John, that has not reached us in its entirety[12] We possess also fragments on Matthew[13], on Luke[14], on Romans, First and Second Corinthians, and Hebrews[15]. An ancient Syriac version, though not without several gaps, exhibits a text of the commentary on Luke more complete and trustworthy than the remnants of the original Greek. His commentaries on the New Testament must have been written after 428, since the Commentary on the Gospel of St. John, the earliest of these writings, refers to the Nestorian heresy. His labors on the Old Testament were completed at an earlier date. His intellectual progress is visible in the distinctness with which the literal sense is grasped and adhered to in the New Testament commentaries. But even in his writings on the Old Testament the historico-

[1] *Migne*, PG., lxxvi. 1065—1132. [2] Ib., lxxvi. 1423—1454.
[3] Bibl. Cod. 54. [4] *Migne*, PG., lxviii. 133—1126.
[5] Ib., lxix. 9—678. [6] Ib., lxx. 9—1450.
[7] Ib., lxxi and lxxii. 9—364. [8] Ib., lxix. 679—698.
[9] Ib., lxix. 717—1274. [10] Ib., lxix. 1273—1294.
[11] Ib., lxx. 1451—1462. [12] Ib., lxxiii and lxxiv. 9—756.
[13] Ib., lxxii. 365—474. [14] Ib., lxxii. 475—950.
[15] Ib., lxxiv. 773—1006.

philological exposition is not neglected, e. g. in the commentary on the twelve minor prophets.

6. HOMILIES AND LETTERS. — Only a small number of his discourses have been preserved[1]: of the *Homiliae paschales* or Festal Letters (see § 63, 7) 29 have come down, quite miscellaneous in their contents. Among the *Homiliae diversae* the most interesting are those delivered at the Council of Ephesus in 431, especially the fourth[2], famous among all the Marian panegyrics of antiquity The *Encomium in S. Mariam Deiparam*[3] is only a much later edition, re-touched and enlarged, of this fourth Ephesine homily. — 88 Letters of Cyril are published[4], but among them are several addressed to him by others. The earliest, and also the most important letters, are those addressed to Nestorius[5], the latter two were read and accepted at the Council of Ephesus in 431, and again at Chalcedon in 451, and at Constantinople in 553. Most of the letters, however, were written after the Council of Ephesus, and deal especially with the relations between himself and the schismatic Antiochenes. The letter to John of Antioch[6] known also as the *Symbolum Ephesinum* was approved and accepted by the Council of Chalcedon.

7 HIS CHRISTOLOGY. — Nestorius had maintained that in Christ there were two personalities united only in a moral sense. It fell to Cyril to maintain and defend the traditional doctrine of the unity of person in Jesus Christ. We have already called attention (see no. 4) to the difference between the concept and exposition of this truth in the earlier as compared with the later writings of Cyril. We have here to describe only the doctrine as found in his writings after the beginning of 429. The Word became man, he teaches, but did not assume a man: *γέγονεν ἄνθρωπος, οὐκ ἄνθρωπον ἀνέλαβεν*[7]: He humbled Himself, but did not raise to Himself a man; He made His own our human nature: *ἰδίαν ἐποιήσατο τὴν σάρκα*: He united Himself with our human nature in a substantial or personal union: *κατ' οὐσίαν, κατὰ φύσιν, καθ' ὑπόστασιν*. He is after the Incarnation what He was before, *εἷς καὶ ὁ αὐτός*: He remained what He was, *μεμένηκε ὅπερ ἦν*; He only assumed our human nature to the unity of His own being, and is now both God and man, one in two natures: *ἐκ δυοῖν τελείοιν, ἐκ δυοῖν πραγμάτοιν, ἐξ ἀμφοῖν*. This one divine not human person is sometimes called *ἕν*, sometimes *ἓν πρόσωπον*, and again *μία ὑπόστασις* or *μία φύσις τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου σεσαρκωμένη*. It is to be noted that Cyril uses as if equivalent the terms *ὑπόστασις* and *φύσις*. The phrase *μία φύσις τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου σεσαρκωμένη*, taken from the profession of faith *περὶ τῆς σαρκώσεως τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου*, among the works of St. Athanasius (§ 63, 3), caused Cyril to be accused of

[1] Ib., lxxvii. 401—1116. [2] Ib., lxxvii. 991—996.
[3] Ib., lxxvii. 1029—1040. [4] Ib., lxxvii. 9—390.
[5] Ep. 2 4 17. [6] Ep. 39. [7] Ep. 45 ad Succ.

teaching a commingling of the two natures in Christ. We must note, therefore, his frequent insistence that he believes the two natures to be united *ἀσυγχύτως*, *ἀτρέπτως*, *ἀναλλοιώτως*, *ἀμεταβλήτως*, without commingling or confusion *(σύγχυσις, σύγκρασις, συνουσίωσις)* of any kind. The phrase that he frequently uses after the reconciliation with the Antiochenes, caused a certain surprise: he says that before the union there were two natures, *φύσεις*, and after it but one *φύσις*. By this phrase, however, Cyril intends only to admit for an ideal moment the conceptual distinction of two individual entities; in other words, he teaches the union of the Logos with a perfect human nature, composed of a body and a (rational) soul; this nature, however, does not subsist independently in itself but in the Logos. He declares elsewhere: «We say that two natures, *δύο φύσεις*, are united, but that after the union there is no longer a division into two (natures); we believe, therefore, in one nature of the Son, *μίαν εἶναι πιστεύομεν τὴν τοῦ υἱοῦ φύσιν*, because He is one, though become man and flesh»[1]. Here as elsewhere Cyril expresses the union of both natures in Christ by the word *ἕνωσις*, a term of Christian origin, to which he often adds a more specific qualitative: *ἕνωσις φυσική*, *κατὰ φύσιν*, *καθ' ὑπόστασιν*, *κατ' οὐσίαν*. He often rejects, as a Nestorian term, the word *ἐνοίκησις* which seemed to diminish the Incarnation to a mere indwelling of the Logos in the man Jesus. Still more positively does he reject another beloved term of Nestorius, the word *συνάφεια* (moral union): «we reject the term *συνάφεια*», he writes to Nestorius, «because it is not fitted to express the union» *(ἕνωσις)*[2]. As a consequence of this union of the two natures, whatever is proper to the human nature may and ought to be predicated of the one divine person (communicatio idiomatum). It was God who suffered and was crucified, the Logos Himself underwent all the sufferings of His human nature because that which suffered was His humanity, His body and His soul. Especially it was also God who was born, and Mary is truly the Mother of God, for the man whom she bore was God. In the word *θεοτόκος* as opposed to the *Χριστοτόκος* or *ἀνθρωποτόκος* of the Nestorians, he found the formula of the true doctrine. He saw clearly that this word was a kind of compendium of the ecclesiastical Christology inasmuch as it presupposes the unity of person and the duality of natures in Christ. He says: «A correct, sufficient, and irreproachable profession of faith is found in the assertion of the divine maternity of the Blessed Virgin: *ἀρκεῖ τοιγαροῦν πρὸς ὀρθὴν καὶ ἀδιάβλητον τῆς πίστεως ἡμῶν ὁμολογίαν τὸ θεοτόκον λέγειν καὶ ὁμολογεῖν τὴν ἁγίαν παρθένον*[3].

8. SPURIOUS WORKS. — Many works have been erroneously attributed to him. *Migne* (PG., lxxvii) mentions the following as *dubia et aliena:*

[1] Ep. 40 ad Acac. [2] Ep. 17 ad Nest.
[3] Hom. 15 de Incarn. Dei verbi.

De sacrosancta trinitate liber (1119—1174), Collectio dictorum Veteris Testamenti anagogice expositorum (1175—1290), Liturgia S. Cyrilli (translated from Coptic into Latin, 1291—1308). On these and other obviously spurious works cf. *Fessler-Jungmann,* Instit. Patrol. ii 2, 78—80. A Coptic homily on death was published under the name of Cyril and translated into French by *E. Amélineau,* Monuments pour servir à l'histoire de l'Egypte chrétienne aux IV$^{e}$ et V$^{e}$ siècles (Mémoires publiés par les membres de la Mission archéologique française au Caire iv), Paris, 1888, pp. 165—195. In order to confirm the doctrine of papal supremacy, Thomas Aquinas quoted in his Opusculum contra errores Graecorum ad Urbanum IV several passages from a work of St. Cyril of Alexandria entitled: In libro thesaurorum. He says himself that he took these citations from the anonymous Libellus de processione Spiritus Sancti (in which Libellus they were said to occur in secundo, according to annother reading in tertio libro thesaurorum). From the Opusculum these passages made their way into works of other Western theologians. These quotations cannot be verified as words of St. Cyril; they are, therefore, and also for intrinsic reasons, to be looked on as spurious, probably forged by the author of the *Libellus.* Cf. *F. H. Reusch,* Die Fälschungen in dem Traktat des Thomas von Aquin gegen die Griechen, in Abhandlungen der kgl. bayer. Akad. der Wissensch., Munich, 1889.

9. COMPLETE EDITIONS. SEPARATE EDITIONS. TRANSLATIONS. — The first and only complete edition of the works of Cyril in the original text is due to a canon of Paris, *J. Aubert,* Paris, 1638, 6 vols. For other editions, complete Latin collections, and earlier Graeco-Latin editions of separate works, cf. *Fabricius-Harles,* Bibl. Gr., ix. 454—457; *Hoffmann,* Bibliograph. Lexikon, Leipzig, 1838—1845, i. 484—494. — In modern times *Mai* in particular published many writings of Cyril whole and fragmentary, unknown to Aubert, and thereby enriched considerably the *Migne* edition of Cyril (PG., lxviii—lxxvii), Paris, 1859. Valuable preliminary work was accomplished by *Ph. Ed. Pusey* in his critical editions of different works of Cyril. For some lately-discovered Coptic papyrus-fragments of the De adoratione in spiritu et veritate (of the books vii and viii) see *J. H. Bernard,* On some fragments of an uncial Ms. of S. Cyril of Alexandria written on papyrus, in The transactions of the Royal Irish Academy, part 18, Dublin, 1892, xxix. 653—672. — We have already mentioned (§ 60, 1) the new edition of the remnants of the work of Julian by *K. J. Neumann.* It contains (pp. 42—63): Cyrilli Alexandrini librorum contra Iulianum fragmenta syriaca, edidit *E. Nestle,* and (pp. 64—87): Cyrilli Alex. librorum contra Iulianum xi—xx fragmenta graeca et syriaca latine reddita, disposuit C. J. Neumann. — *Dogmatico-polemical works:* In the Analecta sacra et classica, Paris, 1888, part 1, pp. 38—46, *Pitra* communicated some manuscript-excerpts of the Liber thesaurorum de sancta et consubstantiali trinitate. — S. P. N. Cyrilli archiepisc. Alex. Epistolae tres oecumenicae, Libri quinque contra Nestorium, XII Capitum explanatio, XII Capitum defensio utraque, Scholia de incarnatione Unigeniti, edidit post Aubertum *Ph. Ed. Pusey,* Oxford, 1875. S. P. N. Cyrilli archiepisc. Alex. De recta fide ad Imperatorem, De incarnatione Unigeniti dialogus, De recta fide ad Principissas, De recta fide ad Augustas, Quod unus Christus, Dialogus Apologeticus ad Imperatorem, edidit post Aubertum *Ph. Ed. Pusey,* Oxford, 1877. In the dialogue De incarnatione Unigeniti (*Migne,* PG., lxxv. 1189—1254) Pusey sees a second edition made by St. Cyril himself of the De recta fide ad Imperatorem. Pusey added to the Greek text of these two works a Syriac version of Rabbulas, bishop of Edessa (§ 83, 4); he also published in his edition of the commentary on the Gospel

of St. John (Oxford, 1872, iii. 476—607) some Greek and Syriac fragments of lost dogmatico-polemical works and of the lost work against the Anthropomorphites (Tractatus ad Tiberium diaconum duo). The latter work is an unsuccessful compilation from the genuine writings of *St. Cyril,* De Dogmatum solutione and Responsio ad Tiberium, with additions from the spurious homily of St. Gregory of Nyssa In diem natalem Christi; cf. Pusey's edition of the commentary on the Gospel of John, iii. 545 f. On a new fragment of the De dogmatum solutione in which the author refers to the Glaphyra and to the commentary on Osee, cf. *G. Mercati,* Varia Sacra, Rome, 1903, pp. 83 f. — *Exegetical works:* The Glaphyra were translated into Syriac by Moses of Aghel (second half of the sixth century); two fragments of that version are found in *F. Guidi,* Rendiconti della R. Accademia dei Lincei (1886), ii. 397—416 545—547. — S. P. N. Cyrilli archiepisc. Alexand. In XII prophetas. Post Pontanum et Aubertum edidit *Ph. Ed. Pusey,* Oxford, 1868, 2 vols. S. P. N. Cyrilli archiep. Alex. In D. Ioannis evangelium. Accedunt fragmenta varia necnon tractatus ad Tiberium diaconum duo. Edidit post Aubertum *Ph. Ed. Pusey,* Oxford, 1872, 3 vols. In Pusey's edition of the commentary on the Gospel of St. John the text is followed (iii. 173—440) by fragments of the commentaries on Romans, 1. and 2. Corinthians, and Hebrews, also (441—451) by a criticism of the fragments in *Migne* (PG., lxxiv. 757—774 1007—1024) relative to the Apocalypse, the Epistle of James, the 1. and 2. of Peter, the 1. of John, and the Catholic Epistle of Jude. — *Homilies and Letters:* Homiletic fragments are extant in Pusey's edition of the commentary on the Gospel of John (iii. 452—475). The Epistolae tres oecumenicae, already mentioned, are (in Pusey) the second and third letters to Nestorius and the letter to John of Antioch (see no. 6). Letter 80 attributed to Cyril by the Chronicon Paschale is only a part of letter n. 260 of Basil the Great; cf. *G. Mercati,* Varia Sacra, Rome, 1903, p. 60, n. 1. Many works of Cyril were translated into Latin during the life of the author by Marius Mercator (§ 95, 1), in particular the three letters to Nestorius, the two apologies for the «anathematisms», and the Scholia de incarnatione Unigeniti (among the works of Marius Mercator; *Migne,* PL., xlviii). In addition to the works and fragments edited by Pusey and Nestle, considerable remnants of a commentary on Luke have been preserved in an ancient Syriac version. S. Cyrilli Alexand. archiep. Commentarii in Lucae evang. quae supersunt Syriace e manuscriptis apud Museum Britannicum edidit *R. Payne Smith,* Oxford, 1858. A Commentary upon the Gospel according to St. Luke, by S. Cyril, patriarch of Alexandria. Now first translated into English from an ancient Syriac version by *R. Payne Smith,* Oxford, 1859, 2 vols. Fragments of the homilies of Cyril of Alexandria on the Gospel of St. Luke, edited from a Nitrian MS. by *W. Wright,* London, 1874. An Armenian version of his works was published at Constantinople, in 1717.

10. NEW VERSIONS. RECENSIONS. WORKS ON CYRIL. — A German translation of select works of Cyril was published by *H. Hayd,* in the Bibliothek der Kirchenväter, Kempten, 1879. An English anonymous version of the Commentary on the Gospel of John was published at London, 1880 to 1886, 2 vols. *A. Ehrhard,* Die Cyrill von Alexandrien zugeschriebene Scrift περὶ τῆς τοῦ κυρίου ἐνανθρωπήσεως, ein Werk Theodorets von Cyrus (Inaug.-Diss.), Tübingen, 1888. *Id.,* Eine unechte Marienhomilie des hl. Cyrill von Alexandrien (i. e. the Encomium in S. Mariam Deiparam: *Migne,* PG., lxxvii. 1029—1040), in Röm. Quartalschr. f. christl. Altertumskunde und f. Kirchengesch. (1889), iii. 97—113. *F. Kohlhofer,* S. Cyrillus Alexandrinus de sanctificatione (Diss. inaug.), Würzburg, 1866. *F. Kopallik,*

Cyrillus von Alexandrien, Mainz, 1881. N. Παγίδας, Κύριλλος ὁ Ἀλεξανδρείας ἀρχιεπίσκοπος, Leipzig, 1884. *F. Loofs,* Leontius von Byzanz, Leipzig, 1887, i. 40—49. *Fr. Schäfer,* Die Christologie des hl. Cyrillus von Alexandrien in der römischen Kirche, pp. 432—534, in Theol. Quartalschr. (1895), lxxvii. 421—447 *E. Weigl,* Die Heilslehre des hl. Cyrill von Alexandrien, Mainz, 1905. Cf. *Hefele,* Konziliengeschichte, 2. ed., ii. 141—288: «Die dritte allgemeine Synode zu Ephesus im Jahre 431.» *A. Rehrmann,* Die Christologie des hl. Cyrillus von Alexandrien, Hildesheim, 1902. As to the responsibility of Cyril for the death of Hypatia, cf. *Fr. Schäfer,* in The Catholic University Bulletin (1902), viii. 441—453. He denies it and lays the blame at the door of Orestes. *E. Michaud,* St. Cyrille d'Alexandrie et l'Eucharistie, in Revue internationale de Théologie (1902), pp. 99—614 675—692.

11. NESTORIUS. — The homilies and letters of Nestorius († after 439) were committed to the flames by order of Theodosius II.; some fragments of them are found in the Acts of the Council of Ephesus and in the writings of Cyril (especially in the 5 books against the blasphemies of Nestorius, see no. 4) and principally (see no. 9) in the versions of Marius Mercator (Sermones 5 Nestorii adv Dei genitricem Mariam, Nestorii sermones 4 adv. haeresim Pelagianam etc.). The twelve counter-anathematisms (see no. 2) have been saved only through the version of Mercator. Some Greek homilies attributed to Chrysostom, Basil of Seleucia, and other homilies delivered in Greek are more or less probably the work of Nestorius, cf. *P. Batiffol,* in Revue Biblique (1900), ix. 329—353. *F. Loofs,* Die Überlieferung und Anordnung der Fragmente des Nestorius (Progr.), Halle, 1904.

12. FRIENDS AND ALLIES OF CYRIL. — One of the first opponents of Nestorius was Proclus, in 426 made bishop of Cyzicus in the Propontis, and in 434 made patriarch of Constantinople († 446). There are attributed to him 25 homilies (*Migne,* PG., lxv. 679—850), the three last of which have been translated from Syriac into Latin, a tractate or rather a fragment of one on the tradition regarding the Holy Mass (περὶ παραδόσεως τῆς θείας λειτουργίας) (ib., 849—852), of very doubtful authenticity, and some letters (ib., 851 to 886) and fragments (ib., 885—888). A Syriac version of the last three homilies is published by *J. B. Chabot,* in Rendiconti della R. Accademia dei Lincei, Cl. di Scienze morali etc., ser. v. 5 (1896), 178—197. For the celebrated Oratio I, De laudibus S. Mariae (*Migne,* PG., lxv. 679—692), cf. *v. Lehner,* Die Marienverehrung in den ersten Jahrhunderten, 2. ed., Stuttgart, 1886, pp. 81 213—217. — A new letter of Proclus, that resembles a profession of faith and is addressed Ad singulos occidentis episcopos, is found in Spicilegium Casinense i. 144—147. Another letter to Isaac the Great is found in the Book of letters, ed. *J. Ismireanz,* Tiflis, 1901. — In 430 some monks of Constantinople, among them Basilius and Thalassius, wrote to the emperor Theodosius complaining of ill-treatment by the patriarch Nestorius and asking for the convocation of an ecumenical council (*Migne,* PG., xci. 1471—1480). — At the Council of Ephesus Memnon, bishop of that city, was a valiant ally of Cyril; we have from his hand one letter addressed in 431 to the clergy of Constantinople (ib., lxxvii. 1463—1466). — Among the clergy of Constantinople none was more energetic and influential at Ephesus in favor of Cyril than the archimandrite Dalmatius; two letters and a so-called apology bear his name (ib., lxxxv. 1797—1802). — Theodotus, bishop of Ancyra in Galatia († before 446), defended the teaching of Cyril bravely at Ephesus; he has left us also an exposition of the creed of the 318 Fathers of the Council of Nicæa (ib., lxxvii. 1313—1348), six homilies (ib., lxxvii. 1349—1432), and

some fragments (ib., lxxvii. 1431—1432). — *E. A. Wallis Budge,* The martyrdom and miracles of St. George of Cappadocia. The Coptic text edited with an English translation (Oriental Text Series I), London, 1888. This work contains besides an account of the martyrdom and miracles of St. George, two panegyrics on the Saint, the first of which (pp. 38—44 236—241) is attributed to Theodosius, Monophysite patriarch of Jerusalem († after 453); the second and the much longer one (pp. 83—172 274—331) is said to be the work of Theodotus, bishop of Ancyra. — Firmus, bishop of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, left 45 short letters (*Migne,* PG., lxxvii. 1481 to 1514); Acacius, bishop of Melitene, left one homily and two letters (ib., lxxvii. 1467—1472); also two letters in Armenian, one to Isaac the Great, the other «to the Armenians», cf. *Ismireanz,* l. c. Of Amphilochius, bishop of Side in Pamphylia, one fragment of a letter (ib., lxxvii. 1515 to 1516) has survived. All three bishops were very prominent at Ephesus in support of Cyril.

13. ADVERSARIES OF CYRIL. — At the beginning of the conflict, John, patriarch of Antioch († 441), took the side of Nestorius (see no. 2), but in 433 was reconciled to Cyril and accepted his view of the heresiarch; a few letters of John are extant (*Migne,* PG., lxxvii. 1449—1462). — At Ephesus, Paul, bishop of Emesa, had been an adherent of the Antiochenes, but later on was mediator between John and Cyril; two or three homilies and a letter bear his name (ib., lxxvii. 1433—1444). — Andrew, bishop of Samosata, attacked in the name of the bishops of Syria the anathematisms of Cyril; some large fragments of his work are extant in the apology of Cyril (see no. 4), also a few letters (ib., lxxxv. 1611—1612). — For the writings of Theodoret of Cyrus against Cyril see § 78, 7. There is also extant a letter of the priest (later on a bishop) Ibas of Edessa († 457) to Maris, bishop of Hardaschir in Persia (*Mansi,* SS. Conc. Coll. vii. 241—250), written probably in 433, in opposition to the anathematisms of Cyril; it obtained a deplorable celebrity during the controversy of the Three Chapters.

14. EUSEBIUS OF ALEXANDRIA. — According to an ancient biography of him, claiming to be the work of a certain John, notary of the Church of Alexandria (*Migne,* PG., lxxxvi 1, 297—310), Eusebius was a monk famed for his virtue, whom Cyril himself consecrated as his successor, and who governed the Alexandrine community for seven (elsewhere John says twenty) years. As a matter of fact it was Dioscurus (§ 78, 12) who succeeded Cyril on the see of Alexandria. So far it has been impossible to throw any light on the personality of this alleged bishop Eusebius. A goodly number of homilies bear the name of Eusebius of Alexandria. *Augusti* maintained (1829) that they were the work of Eusebius of Emesa, but *Thilo* showed (1832) that some at least are ascribed in the manuscripts to Eusebius of Alexandria (§ 61, 2). *A. Mai* discovered and published several other discourses under the name of Eusebius of Alexandria, but intrinsic evidences indicate that they were composed during the fifth century. In *Migne* (PG., lxxxvi 1, 313—462) may be found 22 (21) Sermones Eusebii Alexandrini Episcopi.

### § 78. Theodoret of Cyrus.

1. HIS LIFE. — This the most learned of the adversaries of Cyril was born at Antioch about 386 (393?), and received his early training in the monastic schools of that city. Chrysostom and Theodore of Mopsuestia were his masters, Nestorius and John of Antioch his fellow-students. In 423 he was made bishop of Cyrus, a small town

of Syria about two days' journey from Antioch, but subject to the metropolitan of Hierapolis. Cyrus was the capital of the territory of Cyrestica, a wild and mountainous but thickly populated region. In this office Theodoret displayed tireless zeal, also much generosity and self-sacrifice. He was especially successful in restoring the unity of faith among his diocesans. He could write in 449 to Pope Leo: «With the aid of divine grace I have cleansed more than a thousand souls from the virus of Marcion, and from the party of Arius and Eunomius. I have led back many others to Christ the Lord[1].» It was his interest in the purity of traditional doctrine that led him to enter the lists against Cyril and his anathematisms; he was himself deeply imbued with the theological ideas of the Antiochene school, and believed that the heresy of Apollinaris was lurking in the teachings of Cyril. He maintained these views even after the decisions of the council of Ephesus and refused to give his adhesion to the terms of reconciliation between Cyril and the bishops of the East in 433. The Union-Creed that Cyril then accepted was probably the work of Theodoret, who saw in this act of Cyril a withdrawal of the error contained in his anathematisms; moreover, Theodoret was thereby strengthened in his refusal to condemn Nestorius, the friend of his youth. It was only in 435, apparently, that he joined the «Union», after John of Antioch had renounced his demand for a formal recognition of the condemnation of Nestorius. During the later Monophysite controversies this attitude of Theodoret was the source to him of many and great sufferings. Eutyches, archimandrite of Constantinople, asserted that there was in Christ but one nature, *μία φύσις*, not in the sense of one individual person, as Cyril had taught (§ 77, 7), but in the sense of a compound nature, in which both divinity and humanity had been fused together. Thereby Eutyches affirmed the contrary error or the opposite extreme to Nestorianism, and Dioscurus, patriarch of Alexandria, a rude and uncultured man, sympathized with the ideas of Eutyches; so at the Robber-Synod of Ephesus (449) Dioscurus deposed, without a hearing, Theodoret and other friends of Nestorius. Theodoret appealed to Pope Leo, but was compelled to yield to Monophysite violence and to go into exile. In the following year emperor Marcian recalled him and Pope Leo re-instated him in his see. He assisted at the Council of Chalcedon (451) though Dioscurus and the Monophysites did their best to exclude him; this time he concurred in the anathema against Nestorius and was thoroughly rehabilitated. Thenceforth he lived in peace, concerned only with the business of his diocese and his literary labors. He died (458) in communion with the Church.

2. APOLOGETIC WRITINGS. — Theodoret is the author of the last and most perfect of the early Graeco-Christian apologies. It is entitled

[1] Ep. 113.

«Healing of the heathen ailments, or knowledge of the Gospel truth by way of Hellenic philosophy»: *ἑλληνικῶν θεραπευτικὴ παθημάτων ἢ εὐαγγελικῆς ἀληθείας ἐξ ἑλληνικῆς φιλοσοφίας ἐπίγνωσις*, known also as «Graecarum affectionum curatio»[1]. The preface shows that this title is original; the second half of the title indicates the plan and the spirit of the work. He begins (book 1) by the explanation and refutation of the heathen objection that the apostles were not men of scientific culture; thereupon he compares (books 2—12) the answers given respectively by Christians and heathens to various fundamental questions of philosophy and theology: origin of the world, world of spirits, matter and cosmos, nature of man etc. In this way the light of truth shines with an enhanced splendor in contrast to the darkness of falsehood. In this work he made large use of all preceding apologies, especially the «Stromata» of Clement of Alexandria and the «Evangelical Preparation» of Eusebius of Cæsarea. It was composed, according to Garnier, in 427. The ten long and beautiful discourses: *περὶ προνοίας λόγοι ι'*[2], on God's Providence in the government of the world (Theism versus Deism), are also apologetic in character; they were delivered at Antioch very probably about 432.

3. DOGMATICO-POLEMICAL WRITINGS. — To the year 430, apparently, belongs the famous «Refutation *(ἀνατροπή)* of the twelve anathematisms of Cyril. In his answer, the latter reproduced it, most probably in its entirety[3], thereby saving its text for posterity. Theodoret wrote also a Pentalogium (five books) against Cyril and the Council of Ephesus, but it has perished with the exception of a few fragments[4]. The two books «On the holy and vivifying Trinity» and «On the Incarnation of the Lord»[5] that Ehrhard has successfully restored to Theodoret, were written between 431 and 435. In both of them Cyril and the Fathers of Ephesus are depicted as heirs of the Apollinarist heresy. Theodoret wrote, about 447, an extensive work against Eutychianism or Monophysitism, entitled «The Beggar or the Polymorph»: *ἐρανιστὴς ἤτοι πολύμορφος*[6]. He explains in the preface that the title is justified by the conduct of the Monophysites, whose heresy is nothing more than an ancient miscellaneous folly collected, beggar-wise, from Simon Magus, Cerdo, Marcion, Valentinus, Bardesanes, Apollinaris, Arius and Eunomius. It is divided into four books, in three of which he sets forth by way of dialogues between a Beggar and an Orthodox (believer) the unchangeable *(ἄτρεπτος)* character of the divinity of Christ, the nonmixture *(ἀσύγχυτος)* of the divinity and humanity, and the impassibility *(ἀπαθής)* of the divinity; the fourth book is a syllogistic

[1] *Migne*, PG., lxxxiii. 783—1152.
[2] Ib., lxxxiii. 555—774.
[3] Ib., lxxvi. 385—452; cf. § 77, 4.
[4] Ib., lxxxiv. 65—88.
[5] Ib., lxxv. 1147—1190 1419—1478; cf. § 77, 4.
[6] Ib., lxxxiii. 27—336.

summary *(ἀποδείξεις διὰ συλλογισμῶν)* of the preceding argument. He wrote other dogmatico polemical works that have perished.

4. EXEGETICAL WRITINGS. — They are partly treatises on Bible-texts, partly continuous scripture-commentaries. He wrote treatises of the first kind on the Octateuch (Pentateuch, Josue, Judges, Ruth)[1], on the 4 Books of Kings and also on the 2 Books of Paralipomenon[2]; both of these works proceed by way of question and answer, and were composed toward the end of his life. There are also extant commentaries on the Psalms[3], on the Canticle of canticles[4], on all the prophets[5], on the Epistles of St. Paul[6]. Theodoret is held to be the greatest exegete of Graeco-Christian antiquity Indeed, his commentaries are both copious and excellent in contents, also incomparable models of exegetical style, by reason of their compactness, brevity, and transparent lucidity of diction. His hermeneutical principles are those of the Antiochene school, yet he never falls into the excessive literalness of Theodore of Mopsuestia, as may be seen in the preface to his commentary on the Psalms[7], or in his defence of the allegorical significance of the Canticle of canticles in the preface of his commentary[8] on it. He does not pretend to originality, though he is not content with being merely a compiler of other men's thoughts[9] It may be said that with Theodoret the golden age of the Antiochene school closes; it fell to him to hand over to posterity its highest achievements, and right nobly did he perform his task.

5. HISTORICAL WRITINGS. — His historical writings are also very valuable. His Church History *ἐκκλησιαστικὴ ἱστορία*[10], written about 450, takes up the narrative where Eusebius (§ 62, 2) left off, and treats in five books the vicissitudes of the Church from the beginning of the Arian controversies to the outbreak of Nestorianism (323 to about 428). The narrative centres chiefly about the patriarchate of Antioch. He made use not only of Eusebius, but also of Socrates, Sozomen, and probably of Rufinus. His History of the Monks, *φιλόθεος ἱστορία ἢ ἀσκητικὴ πολιτεία*[11], written about 444, is a very interesting account of the life of celebrated Christian ascetics in the East; it closes with a treatise on the love of God *(περὶ τῆς θείας καὶ ἁγίας ἀγάπης)* as exhibited in the ascetic life[12]. The «Compendium of Heretical Fables», *αἱρετικῆς κακομυθίας ἐπιτομή*[13], composed certainly after the Council of Chalcedon (451), develops in 4 books

[1] Ib., lxxx. 75—528. [2] Ib., lxxx. 527—858.

[3] Ib., lxxx. 857—1998; cf. the supplements, ib., lxxxiv. 19—32.

[4] Ib., lxxxi. 27—214.

[5] Ib., lxxxi. 215—1988; the collection of scholia (ib., 215—494) represents the original text of the commentary on Isaias.

[6] Ib., lxxxii. 35—878. [7] Ib., lxxx. 860. [8] Ib., lxxxi. 29 ff.

[9] Cf. preface to Daniel: ib., lxxxi. 1257, and to the minor prophets: ib., lxxxi. 1548.

[10] Ib., lxxxii. 881—1280. [11] Ib., lxxxii. 1283—1496.

[12] Ib., lxxxii. 1497—1522. [13] Ib., lxxxiii. 335—556.

and in a very concise way the history of heresies since the time of Simon Magus; in the fifth book he confronts the «variations of error» with a sketch of dogmatic and moral faith as found in the Church. The chapter on Nestorius, toward the end of the fourth book, is considered spurious by some scholars.

6. HOMILIES AND LETTERS. — Most of his homilies have perished. The authenticity of the homily on the Nativity of St. John the Baptist[1] is very doubtful. Photius has preserved[2] some passages of the five highly laudatory orations on Chrysostom. There are also extant some homiletic fragments in Latin[3]. His (ten) discourses on Providence already mentioned (see no. 2) are not genuine homilies. — Many of his letters have been preserved[4]. Not to speak of their value for the history of dogma and the history of the Church, these letters of Theodoret have always been prized for the polish and grace of their style, their felicitous diction, and the unpretentious learning that they display. The 48 letters first made known by Sakkelion (1885) exhibit the great bishop principally in his practical relations with the citizens of his episcopal city and the imperial magistrates at Constantinople.

7 CHRISTOLOGY OF THEODORET. — In his book against the anathematisms of Cyril, the Nestorian thesis of a double hypostasis in Christ is accepted and defended by Theodoret. The Fifth Ecumenical Council of Constantinople (553) condemned this work, together with the *Pentalogium,* and some letters and homilies in which Theodoret had manifested his opposition to Cyril and the Council of Ephesus and his sympathies for Nestorius. In his work on the Incarnation of our Lord he begins by rejecting expressly any polemical tendency, but proceeds nevertheless to defend Nestorian doctrine. He accepts the term *θεοτόκος* only in an improper sense and maintains that the term *ἀνθρωποτόκος* is (at least) as justifiable. «The Blessed Virgin», he says at the end, «is called by the masters of piety both Mother of God and Mother of Man, the latter because she bore in reality one like unto herself *(ὡς φύσει τὸν ἐοικότα γεννήσασα);* the former because the figure of the slave is united with the figure of the divinity (*ὡς τῆς τοῦ δούλου μορφῆς καὶ θεοῦ τὴν μορφὴν ἡνωμένην ἐχούσης;* c. 35)». It was only at a later date and gradually that Theodoret grew reconciled to the anathematisms of Cyril and accepted formally and professed the ecclesiastical doctrine of one person in two natures. Though there are some difficulties in the way of this statement, as defended after others by Bertram (1883), it remains true that in the eighth session of the Council of Chalcedon (Oct. 26., 451) Theodoret pronounced «anathema to Nestorius and to whoever does not call the Blessed Virgin Mary the

[1] *Migne,* PG., lxxxiv. 33—48. [2] Ib., lxxxiv. 47—54.
[3] Ib., lxxxiv. 53—64. [4] Ib., lxxxiii. 1173—1494.

Mother of God and divides into two the only Son, the only-Begotten». Thereupon he was solemnly recognized as an «orthodox teacher» by all the Fathers of the Council[1].

8. SPURIOUS WRITINGS. — Seven dialogues, De trinitate adversus Anomoeos, Macedonianos, Apollinaristas (*Migne,* PG., xxviii. 1115—1338, among the works of St. Athanasius: Dialogi V de trinitate and Dialogi II contra Macedonianos) were defended as genuine works of Theodoret by *J. Garnier,* Dissertatio de libris Theodoreti App. (ib., lxxxiv. 367—394), but are now generally considered spurious. According to *J. Dräseke* the first three of these seven dialogues were composed by Apollinaris of Laodicea (§ 61, 4); this is denied by *G. Voizin,* in Revue d'hist. ecclés. (1901), ii. 40—55, who refers them to an unknown author of the fifth century. The little work, Contra Nestorium ad Sporacium (ib., lxxxiii. 1153—1164) was recognized as spurious by *J. Garnier.* The 17 treatises, Adversus varias propositiones i. e. against expressions of Cyril and his orthodox sympathizers (ib., xxviii. 1337—1394, among the works of St. Athanasius under the title: Confutationes quarumdam propositionum) are probably, as Garnerius suggests, the work of Eutherius of Tyana, a Nestorian sympathizer, deposed in 431. For the last two and other spurious works see *Garnier,* l. c., c. 8 (ib., lxxxiv. 351—362). The Quaestiones et responsiones ad orthodoxos of the pseudo-Justinus (cf. § 17, 6) were also erroneously attributed to Theodoret, and published as his by *A. Papadopulos-Kerameus,* St. Petersburg, 1895; cf. *A. Ehrhard,* in Byzant. Zeitschr. (1897), vi. 609—611.

9. COMPLETE EDITIONS. VERSIONS. — A complete edition of the works of Theodoret, with a Latin version (B. Theodoreti episc. Cyri opera omnia), was brought out by *J. Sirmond,* S. J., Paris, 1642, 4 vols. An appendix (B. Theodoreti episc. Cyri auctarium sive operum t. v) was made by *J. Garnier* († 1681), Paris, 1684. This appendix contains among new works and fragments the following very erudite, but very prejudiced studies: Historia Theodoreti, De libris Theodoreti, De fide Theodoreti, de v. Synodo generali, De Theodoreti et Orientalium causa. The edition of Sirmond (and Garnier), was reprinted with improvements and additions by *J. L. Schulze* (and *J. A. Nösselt*), Halle, 1769—1774, 5 vols. (*Migne,* PG., lxxx—lxxxiv, Paris, 1860). Select works of Theodoret were translated into German by *L. Küpper,* Kempten, 1878 (Bibl. der Kirchenväter).

10. SEPARATE EDITIONS AND RECENSIONS. — *Apologetical works:* A separate edition of the Graecarum affectionum curatio was brought out by *Th. Gaisford,* Oxford, 1839. The relations of the «Stromata» of Clement and of the «Praeparatio evangelica» to the apologetical writings of Theodoret are illustrated by *C. Roos,* De Theodoreto Clementis et Eusebii compilatore (Diss. inaug.), Halle, 1883. As to whether and how far Theodoret intended his apology to be a reply to the three books of Julian, cf. *J. R. Asmus,* in Byzant. Zeitschr. (1894), iii. 116—145, and *J. Raeder,* De Theodoreti Graecarum affectionum curatione quaestiones criticae, Kopenhagen, 1900; *Id.,* Analecta Theodoretiana, in Rhein. Museum, new series (1902), lxvii. 449—459 (on a new codex, one of the oldest and most important for the text of Theodoret). — For a Bodleian Psalm-catena containing unedited fragments of Theodoret cf. *M. Faulhaber,* in Theol. Quartalschr. (1901), lxxxiii. 218—232. — *Exegetical works: Fr. A. Specht,* Der exegetische Standpunkt des Theodor von Mopsuestia und Theodoret von Kyros in der Auslegung messianischer Weissagungen aus ihren Kommentaren zu den kleinen Propheten dargestellt, Munich, 1871. — *Historical works:* The

[1] *Mansi,* SS. Conc. Coll., vii. 189.

editio princeps of his Church History was published by *H. Valesius,* Paris, 1673, et saepius (§ 62, 7); the latest edition is that of *Th. Gaisford,* Oxford, 1854. *A. Güldenpenning,* Die Kirchengeschichte des Theodoret von Kyrrhos. Eine Untersuchung ihrer Quellen, Halle, 1889. Cf. *G. Rauschen,* Jahrbb. der christl. Kirche unter dem Kaiser Theodosius d. Gr., Freiburg i. Br., 1897, pp. 559—563. — *Homilies and Letters:* Τοῦ μακαριωτάτου Θεοδωρήτου ἐπισκόπου Κύρου ἐπιστολαὶ δυοῖν δεούσαιν πεντήκοντα ἐκ Πατμιακοῦ χειρογράφου τεύχους νῦν πρῶτον τύποις ἐκδιδόμεναι ὑπὸ Ἰωάννου Σακκελιῶνος, Athens, 1885.

11. WORKS ON THEODORET. — Late studies of a general character are: *Ad. Bertram,* Theodoreti episc. Cyrensis doctrina christologica, Hildesheim, 1883. *N. Glubokowski,* The Blessed Theodoret, bishop of Cyrus (Russian), Moscow, 1890, 2 vols.; cf. *Harnack,* in Theol. Literaturzeitung (1890), pp. 502—504.

12. DIOSCURUS. — Under the name of Dioscurus (see no. 1), the successor of Cyril, who occupied the see of Alexandria from 444 to 451 and died in exile at Gangrä in Paphlagonia (Sept. 4., 454), there was made public and translated into French by *E. Amélineau,* in the Monuments pour servir à l'histoire de l'Egypte chrétienne aux IV^e^ et V^e^ siècles, Paris, 1888 (cf. § 77, 8), pp. 92—164, a Coptic panegyric on Macarius of Tkhôu. This panegyric exhibits a discourse on the Council of Chalcedon addressed to an Egyptian embassy, charged with making known to the former patriarch in his exile at Gangrä the death of the aforesaid Macarius. It is neither a genuine nor a trustworthy work. Cf. *F. Nau,* Histoire de Dioscore, patriarche d'Alexandrie, écrite par son disciple Théophiste, Syriac and French, in Journal Asiatique, series X (1903), i. 5—108 241—310. It has also been edited from the Coptic by *W. E. Crum,* in Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archeology (1903), xxv. 267—276.

### § 79. Other writers of the first half of the fifth century.

1. MACARIUS MAGNES, APOLOGIST. — Macarius Magnes (i. e. of Magnesia) is the author of an extensive apologetic work, first made known by Blondel, in 1876, but in a very defective and incomplete manner. The work relates in five books an (imaginary) dispute of five days' duration between the author and a pagan philosopher. The latter attacks or caricatures certain passages of the New Testament, especially the Gospels and the Acts, while the former defends and expounds the biblical text, not unfrequently with far-fetched refinement. The philosopher's objections are mostly taken from the (lost) books of the Neoplatonist Porphyry († ca. 304) «Against the Christians». The original title of the «Apology» was probably «Unigenitus, or a reply to the heathens»: *μονογενὴς ἢ ἀποκριτικὸς πρὸς Ἕλληνας;* it is possible that in the (lost) prologue of the work we should recognize the motive for the principal title. Intrinsic evidence makes it probable that the work was composed after 410. It is almost certain that the author was Macarius, bishop of Magnesia (in Caria or in Lydia), who, according to *Photius*[1], in 403 stood forth at the «Synod of the Oak» (§ 74, 4) as the accuser of Heraclides,

[1] Bibl. Cod. 59.

bishop of Ephesus and friend of Chrysostom. Under the name of the same Magnes are current also some fragments of an exposition of Genesis.

Μακαρίου Μάγνητος Ἀποκριτικὸς ἢ Μονογενής. Macarii Magnetis quae supersunt ex inedito codice edidit *C. Blondel,* Paris, 1876. *L. Duchesne,* De Macario Magnete et scriptis eius, Paris, 1877. Cf. *Th. Zahn,* in Zeitschrift f. Kirchengesch. (1877—1878), ii. 450—459; *Wagenmann,* in Jahrb. f. Deutsche Theol. (1878), xxiii. 269—314; *C. F. Neumann,* Scriptorum graec. qui christianam impugnaverunt religionem quae supersunt, fasc. III, Leipzig, 1880, pp. 14—23 245. The Genesis-fragments are found in *Duchesne,* De Macario Magnete, pp. 39—43, and in *Pitra,* Analecta sacra et classica, Paris, 1888, part 1, pp. 31—37. Additional fragments were published by *A. Sauer,* in Festschrift zum elfhundertjährigen Jubiläum des deutschen Campo Santo in Rom, Freiburg i. Br., 1897, pp. 291—295. On a quotation from Macarius (ii. 22) relative to the presence of St. Peter at Rome, and taken from a heathen writer, cf. *A. Harnack,* in Theol. Literaturzeitung (1902), pp. 604—605. *F. H. Bernard,* Macarius Magnes, in Journal of Theol. Studies (1901), ii. 610—611. — De sancta trinitate, De effectu baptismi, De cruce (*Migne,* PG., xl. 847—866) in the form of dialogues, were said to belong to Jerome, a priest of Jerusalem, about the end of the fourth century, but it appears that the work from which they are taken must have been written in the eighth century. Cf. *P. Batiffol,* Jérôme de Jérusalem d'après un document inédit, in Revue des questions historiques, Paris, 1886, xxxix. 248—255. The same Jerome is quoted in a Psalm-catena, cf. *Ehrhard,* in *Krumbacher,* Gesch. der byzant. Literatur (2. ed.), p. 214.

2. CHURCH HISTORIANS. — About 430 the priest Philippus Sidetes (of Side in Pamphylia) published a «Christian History» (*χριστιανικὴ ἱστορία*), that is described by Socrates[1] as a very extensive but rambling work, and without chronological sequence. This work and the same author's reply to the three books of Julian «Against the Galilæans»[2] have been lost, with the exception of a fragment and some anonymous extracts. A similar fate befell three other ecclesiastical histories more or less of the same period: the Church history (*ἐκκλησιαστικὴ ἱστορία?*) of Hesychius, a priest of Jerusalem (see no 3), the *ἐκκλησιαστικὴ ἱστορία* of Timotheus, Apollinarist bishop of Berytus, and the collection of the acts of the councils (*συναγωγὴ τῶν συνοδικῶν*), made by Sabinus, Macedonian bishop of Heraclea in Thrace. The work of Hesychius furnished the Fathers of the fifth General Council (553) with a portrait of Theodore of Mopsuestia[3]. Timotheus, according to Leontius of Byzantium[4], had no other purpose than to glorify Apollinaris; with that end in view he collected a multitude of letters between the heresiarch and his contemporaries. Sabinus dealt with the Eastern synods from that of Nicæa to the time of Valens (364—378); Socrates[5] accuses him repeatedly of deliberate alteration and falsification of facts in the interest of the Semiarians.

[1] Hist. eccl., vii. 26—27; cf. *Phot.,* Bibl. Cod. 35.
[2] *Socr.,* Hist. eccl., vii. 27.
[3] *Mansi,* SS. Conc. Coll., ix. 248—249.
[4] Adv. Nest. et Eut., iii. 40.
[5] Hist. eccl., i. 8 9; ii. 15 17, etc.

The ecclesiastical history *(ἐκκλησιαστικὴ ἱστορία)* of Philostorgius, Eunomian bishop in Cappadocia, was more widely read than the preceding ones, although it was also, according to Photius[1] «less a history than an eulogy of the (Arian) heretics and a defamatory onslaught on the orthodox»; it treated in twelve books the period from the first appearance of Arius to 423. Photius made a considerable extract from it, and some small fragments also have been preserved[2]. About the middle of the fifth century three other ecclesiastical histories that have reached us in their entirety were produced. Socrates, an advocate *(σχολαστικός)* of Constantinople, announces formally that he intends to continue the Church History of Eusebius (§ 62, 2). In the seven books of his Church History *(ἐκκλησιαστικὴ ἱστορία)*[3], he treats the period from the abdication of Diocletian (305) to 439. His diction is more plain and simple than that of Eusebius, and he is also more sincere and upright in his narrative; in Socrates there is also manifest a capacity to examine the sources of his historical information and to trace out the relations of cause and effect in the events that he relates. In the first half of his work he made use of Eusebius and Rufinus, also of Sabinus and the historico-polemical writings of St. Athanasius. Less important is the production of another advocate of Constantinople, Hermias Sozomenus Salaminius. His work *(ἐκκλησιαστικὴ ἱστορία)*[4] is divided into nine books and reaches from 324 to 425. The frequent parallelism of narrative in these two writers had always awakened a suspicion of literary dependency on one side: it is now ascertained that Sozomen frequently copies the text of Socrates, though he often consults the latter's authorities and then enlarges his precedessor's narrative with materials borrowed directly from them. Sozomen also wrote a compendium of ecclesiastical history[5] from the Ascension to 323, the year of the overthrow of Licinius, but it has perished. For the ecclesiastical history of Theodoret cf. § 78, 5.

*C. de Boor,* Zur Kenntnis der Handschriften der griechischen Kirchenhistoriker. Codex Baroccianus 142, in Zeitchr. f. Kirchengesch. (1883 to 1884), vi. 478—494 (a critical description of the fourteenth- or fifteenth-century Oxford codex (Barocc. 142) that contains a collection of extracts from the Greek ecclesiastical historians, made probably in the seventh or eighth century. This codex furnishes the extracts from Philippus Sidetes: An extract on the masters of the Alexandrine schools is found in *H. Dodwell,* Dissertationes in Irenaeum, Oxford, 1689, p. 488; several small extracts and fragments of Papias, Hegesippus and Pierius are to be seen in *de Boor,* Texte und Untersuchungen (1888), v 2, 165—184. For a fragment of Philippus of Side cf. *Neumann,* l. c. (see no. 1), p. 34. For Timotheus of Berytus cf. § 61, 4. *Fr. Geppert,* Die Quellen des Kirchenhistorikers Sokrates Scholasticus, Leipzig, 1898, in Studien zur Gesch. der

[1] Bibl. Cod. 40. [2] *Migne,* PG., lxv. 459—638. [3] Ib., lxvii. 29—842.
[4] Ib., lxvii. 843—1630. [5] *Sozom.,* Hist. eccl., i. 1.

Theol. und der Kirche, iii. 4, attempted a reconstruction of the history of the Councils by Sabinus; cf. *P. Batiffol,* in Byzant. Zeitschrift (1898), vii. 265—284, and (1901), x. 128—143. The editio princeps of the fragments of Philostorgius and of Socrates and Sozomen is due to *H. Valesius,* Paris, 1673 et saepius; cf. § 62, 7. The Valesius-Reading edition (Cambridge, 1720) is reprinted in *Migne,* PG., lxv—lxvii. A separate edition of Socrates was brought out by *R. Hussey,* Oxford, 1853, 3 vols., and one of Sozomen by the same, ib., 1860, 3 vols. An Armenian version of Socrates, by Philo Tirachazi (seventh century), was edited by *M. Ter. Mosesean,* Valarschapat, 1897. — *L. Jeep,* Quellenuntersuchungen zu den griechischen Kirchenhistorikern, Leipzig, 1884. *P. Batiffol,* Quaestiones Philostorgianae (Thesis), Paris, 1891; *Jeep,* Zur Überlieferung des Philostorgius, Leipzig, 1898, in Texte und Untersuchungen, xvii, new series, ii. 3b. *Geppert,* l. c. — On June 30., 446, Hypatius, the spiritual father of all the monks in and around Constantinople, died in the monastery of Rufinianæ near Chalcedon, at the age of eighty. He was held in high esteem by the emperor Theodosius II. and the royal family. His eventful and highly beneficent career was described in a plain and popular style about 447—450 by his disciple and companion Callinicus. The defective edition of this extensive biography in the Acta SS. Jun., Venet. 1743, iii. 308—349, is now replaced by a complete edition published at Bonn, 1895, by the members of the Philological Seminar of that university.

3. EXEGETES. — The monk and priest Adrian, or Hadrian, who must have lived about the first half of the fifth century and belonged to the circle of Antiochene exegetes, wrote an introduction to the Sacred Scripture: *εἰσαγωγὴ εἰς τὰς θείας γραφάς*[1], in which he explained the origin and meaning of the figurative expressions of Scripture, principally those of the Old Testament. The term «Introduction to Scripture» appears for the first time in this work, and indicates what was afterwards known as hermeneutics. — The exegetical principles of the Antiochene school were developed much more clearly and definitely by St. Isidore, priest and abbot of a mountain monastery near Pelusium in Egypt († ca. 440). Though he did not compose, as far as we know, any considerable exegetical work, the greater part of his correspondence, about 2000 letters in five books[2], deals with exegetical subjects. As a disciple of St. Chrysostom, he follows the grammatico-historical method of the Antiochene school, but without rejecting allegorical interpretations when they serve the purpose of edification. In this copious collection of letters there are many that deal with dogmatic or ascetico-moral matters, even with personal affairs. They illustrate the author's own principle of unaffected elegance[3] and are praised by Photius as models of epistolary style[4]. Two treatises of Isidore, casually mentioned in his letters, on the non-existence of Fate *(λογίδιον περὶ τοῦ μὴ εἶναι εἱμαρμένην)*[5] and Against the heathens *(λόγος πρὸς Ἕλληνας)*[6], are not really lost to us; they are extant in the long letter addressed

[1] *Migne,* PG., xcviii. 1273—1312. [2] Ib., lxxviii. 177—1646.
[3] Ep. v. 133. [4] Ep. ii. 44. [5] Ep. iii. 253. [6] Ep. ii. 137 228.

to the sophist Arpocras[1]. — The literary remains of the monk and priest Hesychius of Jerusalem († 433) await more thorough research. Much of what has been current under his name belongs to writers of the same name that lived at a later period. Other works, probably written by him, have perished, at least in part, e. g. his ecclesiastical history (see no. 2), while some of his writings remain still unedited. In *Migne* he is credited with a diffuse and allegorical exposition of Leviticus extant in Latin versions only, with some Greek Psalm-fragments, and some scholia to Ezechiel, Daniel, Acts of the Apostles, Epistle of James, First Peter, Jude[2]. He is also the reputed author of a so-called *στιχηρόν* of the twelve minor prophets and of Isaias[3] i. e. an analysis of the contents of these books, with a division of the text into *στίχοι* or chapters, and a collection of objections and solutions: *συναγωγὴ ἀποριῶν καὶ ἐπιλύσεων*[4], a kind of harmony illustrating by way of question and answer 61 Gospel-problems. Finally, there are extant under his name some homilies and fragments of homilies[5], a collection of spiritual maxims entitled Directions for conflict and prayer *(ἀντιρρητικὰ καὶ εὐκτικά)*[6], also a. Martyrium S. Longini centurionis[7]. Besides new specimens of his gloss on the minor prophets, the complete text of his gloss on Isaias has been lately published by Faulhaber. Hesychius belongs to the school of the allegorists.

Adrian's εἰσαγωγὴ εἰς τὰς θείας γραφάς, aus neu aufgefundenen Handschriften herausgegeben, übersetzt und erläutert von *Fr. Gössling,* Berlin, 1888. *P. B. Glueck,* Isidori Pelusiotae summa doctrinae moralis, Würzburg, 1848. *L. Bober,* De arte hermeneutica S. Isidori Pelusiotae, Cracow, 1878. *E. L. A. Bouvy,* De S. Isidoro Pelusiota libri iii, Nîmes, 1885. See also *V Lundström,* De Isidori Pelusiotae epistolis recensendis praelusiones, in Eranos (1897), ii. 68—80. *N. Capo,* De S. Isidori Pelusiotae epistularum locis ad antiquitatem pertinentibus, in Bessarione, vi (1901—1902), series II, i. 342—363; *Id.,* De S. Isidori Pelusiotae epistolarum recensione ac numero quaestio, in Studi italiani di filologia (1901), ix. 449—466; cf. § 40, 4. *C. H. Turner,* The Letters of St. Isidore of Pelusium, in Journal of Theol. Studies (1904), vi. 70—86. *E. K. Lake,* Further Notes on the Mss. of Isidore of Pelusium, in Journal of Theol. Studies (1905), vi. 270—282. — For glosses of Hesychius on Abdias and Zacharias see *M. Faulhaber,* Die Prophetenkatenen nach römischen Handschriften, Freiburg i. Br., 1899 (Biblische Studien, iv. 2—3), pp. 21—26 32—33. Hesychii Hierosolymitani interpretatio Isaiae prophetae, nunc primum in lucem edita a *M. Faulhaber,* Freiburg i. Br., 1900; *Faulhaber,* in Theol. Quartalschr. (1901), lxxxiii. 218—232, and *G. Mercati,* in Note di letteratura biblica e cristiana antica (Studi e testi v), Rome, 1901, have shown that the Psalm-commentary printed among the works of St. Athanasius (*Migne,* PG., xxvii. 649 to 1344) belongs to Hesychius. *B. Sargisean,* in Compte-rendu du IV[e] Congrès scientifique internat. des Catholiques (Freiburg in Switzerland, 1898),

[1] Ep. iii. 154. [2] *Migne,* PG., xciii. 787—1180; 1179—1340; 1385—1392.
[3] Ib., xciii. 1339—1386. [4] Ib., xciii. 1391—1448.
[5] Ib., xciii. 1449—1480. [6] Ib., xciii. 1479—1544.
[7] Ib., xciii. 1545—1560.

pp. 216—218, mentions an Armenian version of a commentary on Job said to be the work of our Hesychius.

4. ASCETIC WRITERS. — A certain Palladius, disciple of the Origenist writer Evagrius Ponticus and later on a bishop in Asia Minor, compiled about 420 a number of monastic biographies *(ἡ πρὸς Λαῦσον ἱστορία περιέχουσα βίους ὁσίων πατέρων)*[1], known as *Historia Lausiaca (Λαυσιακόν, Λαυσαϊκόν)* from the name of Lausus, a prominent official to whom the work was addressed. This Palladius is easily identified with the biographer of Chrysostom (§ 74, 18) and must not be confounded with the contemporary Palladius, bishop of Helenopolis in Bithynia. During two journeys he had seen with his own eyes the monastic life principally in Egypt and Palestine, he also probably had access to special works on the subject. Sozomen[2] tells us that Timotheus, patriarch of Alexandria (380—384), had already published a (lost) collection of monastic biographies. The Historia Lausiaca is a reliable and valuable authority for the history of primitive monachism. It was a beloved work of edification in the monasteries, and was, therefore, often translated and arbitrarily re-arranged. Preuschen and Butler have shown that it is possible to reconstruct the original text. The usual text[3] is interpolated through the incorporation with it of a Greek: Historia monachorum in Aegypto. Preuschen maintains that the incorporated text is a Greek translation of the Latin: Historia monachorum, of Rufinus of Aquileia, while Butler concludes that the interwoven text is the Greek original itself, translated into Latin by Rufinus. — Prominent among the ascetic writers of this period is St. Nilus, who resigned a high office at the imperial court, and with his son Theodulus took refuge with the monks of Mount Sinai among whom he died ca. 430. His works may be divided, apart from a few fragments, into treatises, letters, and apophthegms[4] The treatises deal partly with the principal virtues of the Christian life and the contrary vices: Peristeria seu tractatus de virtutibus excolendis et vitiis fugiendis, De oratione, De octo spiritibus malitiae, De vitiis quae opposita sunt virtutibus, De diversis malignis cogitationibus, Sermo in effatum illud Lk. xxii. 36, and partly with the monastic life in particular: Oratio in Albianum, De monastica exercitatione, De voluntaria paupertate, De monachorum praestantia, Tractatus ad Eulogium monachum. The: Narrationes de caede monachorum in monte Sinai, treat of events in the life of the author, his son and the monks of Mount Sinai. Other treatises are generally considered spurious; but even as regards the above-mentioned there is some uncertainty and confusion. Of the 1061 letters that Leo Allatius published (1668) under the name of St. Nilus, only a very few can claim

[1] Ib., xxxiv. 995—1287: columns 177—208 offer a new text-recension.
[2] Hist. eccl., vi. 29. [3] *Migne*, l. c. [4] Ib., lxxix.

to be original in their present shape; all the others are clearly extracts from letters or other writings. — Marcus, known as Eremita (*μοναχός, ἀσκητής*), was, according to Nicephorus Callistus[1], a contemporary of St. Isidore of Pelusium and St. Nilus, and also a disciple of St. Chrysostom. Kunze says (1895) that he was abbot of a monastery at Ancyra (in Galatia) in the first half of the fifth century and withdrew in his old age to the desert, probably the desert of Juda. Nicephorus says[2] that he left at least forty ascetic treatises (*λόγοι*). There are now extant under his name the ten following: De lege spirituali, De his qui putant se ex operibus iustificari, De poenitentia, Responsio ad eos qui de divino baptismate dubitabant, Praecepta animae salutaria, Capitula de temperantia, Disputatio cum quodam causidico, Consultatio intellectus cum sua ipsius anima, De ieiunio, De Melchisedech[3] Photius had already quoted[4] and criticized individually the afore-said treatises, with exception of the: Capitula de temperantia; the latter text is not genuine, since it is clearly put together from the works of Macarius the Egyptian and Maximus Confessor. Papadopulos-Kerameus edited (1891) a work of Marcus, *Adversus Nestorianos*. The treatise De Melchisedech is not an ascetical but a dogmatico-polemical work. — The Egyptian Arsenius († ca. 449) left two discourses: Doctrina et exhortatio[5], and: Ad nomicum tentatorem[6]; the latter was discovered and published by Mai (1838). — Diadochus, bishop of Photice in Epirus, about the middle of the fifth century, left: Capita centum de perfectione spirituali[7], and a: Sermo de ascensione D. N. Jesu Christi[8], first published by Mai (1840).

All earlier works on the Historia Lausiaca are now superseded by *E. Preuschen*, Palladius und Rufinus, Giessen, 1897, and *C. Butler*, The Lausiac History of Palladius, i—ii, Cambridge, 1898 1904, in Texts and Studies, vi. 1 2. The work of Preuschen contains also the text of the Greek Historia monachorum in Aegypto (published completely for the first time) and the most important chapters of the Historia Lausiaca in their original form. *C. H. Turner*, The Lausiac History of Palladius, in Journal of Theol. Studies (1905), vi. 321—355. On Nilus see *Fessler-Jungmann*, Instit. Patrol. (1896), ii 2, 108—128. *J. Kunze*, Markus Eremita, ein neuer Zeuge für das altkirchliche Taufbekenntnis, Leipzig, 1895; Kunze uses an improved recension (pp. 6—30) of the Adversus Nestorianos, edited by *A. Papadopulos-Kerameus* (Ἀνάλεκτα ἱεροσολυμιτικῆς σταχυολογίας), St. Petersburg, 1891, i. 89—113; apropos of the baptismal creed mentioned in this work Kunze has made extensive researches on the life and writings of Marcus Eremita. Cf. *Kunze*, in Theol. Literaturblatt (1898), xix. 393—398. On Arsenius cf. *Fessler-Jungmann*, l. c., ii 2, 293 f., on bishop Diadochus, ib., 147 f. The codices attribute to a Marcus Diadochus a Sermo contra Arianos (*Migne*, PG., lxv. 1149—1166) but the author apparently lived in the fourth century and is not identical with the bishop of Photice. *E. A.*

[1] Hist. eccl., xiv. 30 53 54. [2] Ib., xiv. 54. [3] *Migne*, PG., lxv.
[4] Bibl. Cod. 200. [5] *Migne*, PG., lxvi. 1617—1622.
[6] Ib., lxvi. 1621—1626. [7] Ib., lxv. 1167—1212.
[8] Ib., lxv. 1141—1148.

*Wallis Budge,* The Book of Paradise, being the Histories and Sayings of the Monks and Ascetics of the Egyptian Desert by Palladius, Hieronymus and others. The Syriac Texts, according to the Recension of 'Anan-Isho of Beth-'Abhe, edited with an English translation, 2 vols., London, 1904, lxxviii, 1095 and 768 pp.

5. POETS. — Evagrius mentions[1] two Christian poets of the time of Theodosius II. (408—450): Claudianus and Cyrus. Under the name of Claudianus there are[2] seven Greek epigrams, two of which are addressed to our Lord, and two fragments of a Greek *Gigantomachia.* It is generally believed that this Claudian is no other than the celebrated Latin poet Claudius Claudianus († ca. 408) under whose name there are also current some brief Latin poems of a Christian character: De Salvatore or Carmen paschale, Laus Christi, Miracula Christi[3] Claudius Claudianus did certainly write also some Greek poems. But it is doubtful whether his mind was sufficiently Christian, or rather sufficiently de-paganized, to permit us to look on him as the author of any Christian poetry.

*Th. Birt,* in the recent edition of the Carmina of Claudius Claudianus, Berlin, 1892 (Monum. Germ. histor. Auct. antiquiss. x) holds (Proleg., pp. lxiii—lxviii) that the first of the three Latin pieces (De Salvatore, 330—331) is genuine, the other two (411—413) spurious (Proleg., pp. clxx to clxxii), and the two Christian epigrams in Greek (421—422) dubious (Proleg., p. lxxiv). *Arens* treats the De Salvatore as spurious; cf. *Ed. Arens,* Quaestiones Claudianae (Diss. inaug.), Münster, 1894, pp. 22—42, and Histor. Jahrb. (1896), xvii. 1—22. The Greek pieces attributed to Claudian were edited anew, together with the poems of the empress Eudocia, by *A. Ludwich,* Leipzig, 1897. — Eudocia, wife of Theodosius II. (married June 7., 421), enjoys the reputation of a poetess; we have from her pen one verse of an encomium on Antioch in 444, two verses of a paraphrase of the Octateuch, some long fragments of an epic poem in three parts on the martyrdom of St. Cyprian of Antioch based on the Confessio Cypriani in prose, and other long fragments of an Ὁμηρόκεντρα or Homer-Cento, a counterpart to the Vergil-Cento of Proba. We hear also of a poem written by Eudocia on a victory of Theodosius II. over the Persians (422) and of a paraphrase of the prophets Daniel and Zacharias. The remnants of the epic on St. Cyprian are in *Migne,* PG., lxxxv. 831 to 864. As stated above all her poetic remains were edited by *A. Ludwich,* Leipzig, 1893 1897. — For the Greek hymnographers of the fifth century cf. § 105, 1.

[1] Hist. eccl., i. 19.

[2] *Migne,* PL., liii. 789, among the works of Claudianus Mamertus.

[3] Ib., liii. 788—790.

## SECOND SECTION.

# SYRIAC WRITERS.

### § 80. Preliminary observations.

It is uncertain whether there existed in Syria a pre-Christian national literature. The second century saw the beginnings of a Christian national literature, of the oldest monuments of which only a few remains survive (§ 18, 3; 19, 3, etc.). From that time the theological school of Edessa was not only a seminary for the Persian clergy, but also the centre of all the academic and literary activity of Syria. Its highest development was reached in the course of the fourth century, when Ephræm appears as at once its greatest doctor and the best representative of its peculiar characteristics. The school of Edessa is intimately related to the school of Antioch (§ 60, 3); like the latter it is devoted to the literal interpretation of the Scriptures and opposed to the allegorizing method of the Alexandrines. The East-Syrian school is decidedly Oriental as compared with the West-Syrian school: it is more mystic and contemplative, and produced more poetical works, at the same time it exhibits a lack of speculative power and a strong aversion to all change or evolution. The Christological heresies of the fifth century inflicted deep and irreparable wounds on the Church of Syria. The last prop and refuge of Nestorianism within the limits of the Roman empire was the school of Edessa; it was, therefore, closed by the emperor Zeno in 489. From its ruins arose, in Persia, the Nestorian school of Nisibis. Monophysitism found also many sympathizers in the Syrian Church, the efforts of Justinian to suppress that heresy were rendered futile by the tireless activity of the monk Jacob Baradæus (since 541 bishop of Edessa, † 578), from whom the Syrian Monophysites take the name of Jacobites. From the middle of the fifth to the end of the twelfth century, when the united Maronites (1182) began to manifest a literary activity, nearly all prominent Syriac writers are either Nestorians or Jacobites.

The first satisfactory introduction to the treasures of Syriac literature was afforded Western scholars by the Marionite *J. S. Assemani* († Jan. 14., 1768, at Rome) in his Bibliotheca Orientalis: *J. S. Assemani,* Bibliotheca Orientalis Clementino-Vaticana, Tomus I: De Scriptoribus Syris Orthodoxis. Tomus II: De Script. Syris Monophysitis. Tomi III pars 1 De Script. Syris Nestorianis. Tomus IV seu tomi III pars 2: De Syris Nestorianis, Rome, 1719—1728, 4 vols. *Graffin* was the first to begin a complete collection of the Syriac Fathers: Patrologia Syriaca complectens opera omnia Ss. patrum, doctorum scriptorumque catholicorum, quibus accedunt aliorum acatholicorum auctorum scripta quae ad res ecclesiasticas pertinent, quotquot syriace supersunt, accurante *R. Graffin.* Pars prima ab initiis usque ad annum 350. Tomus I (Aphraatis Demonstrationes i—xxii), cuius

textum syriacum vocalium signis instruxit, latine vertit, notis illustravit *J. Parisot,* Paris, 1894. The original texts of the Fathers and other Syriac writers, with Latin versions, are also included in the new collection: Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum orientalium curantibus *J. B. Chabot, Ign. Guidi, H. Hyvernat, B. Carra de Vaux.* The Conspectus rei Syrorum litterariae by *G. Bickell,* Münster, 1871, is a very useful account of the printed Syriac literature. A very accurate and approximatively complete catalogue of all the printed editions of Syriac texts is found in *E. Nestle,* Syrische Grammatik, Berlin, 1888, ii. 1—66. Sketches of the history of Syriac literature were written by *W. Wright,* A Short History of Syriac Literature, London, 1894; *R. Duval,* La littérature syriaque (Bibliothèque de l'enseignement de l'histoire ecclésiastique, Anciennes littératures chrétiennes), Paris, 1899, 2. ed. 1900. — Patrologia orientalis, publiée sous la direction de *R. Graffin* et *F. Nau,* vol. ii, tome i, fasc. 1: Le livre des mystères du ciel et de la terre, texte éthiopien, publié et traduit par *J. Perruchon* avec le concours de *J. Guidi,* xii—97; fasc. 2: History of the Patriarchs of the Coptic Church of Alexandria I: Saint Mark to Theonas (300). Arabic text edited, translated and annotated by *B. Evett.* Vol. ii, tome ii, fasc. 1 Vie de Sévère, par Zacharie le Scholastique; texte syriaque, publié, traduit et annoté par *M. A. Kugener;* fasc. 2: Les apocryphes I: Les évangiles des douze apôtres et de Saint Barthélémy. Texte copte, traduction française par *Rivellont,* Paris, 1904.

### § 81. Aphraates.

1. HIS LIFE. — Jacob Aphraates, bishop of Mar Matthæus, known as «the Persian sage», is rightly called the oldest of the Syrian Fathers. As early as 1756 Nicolo Antonelli published an Armenian text and a Latin translation of 19 homilies or tractates of «the Persian sage». Following the authority of his manuscripts Antonelli attributed the homilies to Saint Jacob (James) of Nisibis, the friend and patron of Ephræm (§ 82, 1), and held that they had been addressed to Saint Gregory Illuminator, the Apostle of Armenia (§ 109, 2). A century later all doubt was cleared away when in 1869 W Wright discovered the Syriac original text of 23 homilies of «the Persian sage». It was then seen that they were addressed to a monk, possibly an abbot, named Gregory, who had besought the author for spiritual instruction in the Catholic faith. Jacob is the name which, according to Syrian custom, was taken by Aphraates when he was made bishop. So far as is known Jacob of Nisibis left no writings. The date of Aphraates' literary activity is fixed for us by his own statements: the first ten homilies were composed in the year 648 of the Alexandrian era (A. D. 336—337), the following twelve in 655 of the same era (A. D. 343—344), and the last homily in 656 (A. D. 345, August). Aphraates was a monk, later on a bishop in the Persian monastery of Mar Matthæus (= St. Matthew), somewhat to the east of Mosul. Quite probably he was even then a bishop of some importance in the Mesopotamian hierarchy. The monastery of Mar Matthæus became at a later date the see of the Jacobite metropolitan of Ninive, next in importance to the Maphrian

or primate of the Oriental Jacobites. Since the twelfth century the titular of Mar Matthæus is also known as Maphrian.

2. WRITINGS OF APHRAATES. — With exception of the last, the above-mentioned homilies are alphabetically arranged, in the order of the 22 letters of the Syrian alphabet; thereby they proclaim themselves a complete work. The longest of them is the last, entitled «the Cluster», i. e. the blessed cluster because of which the vine is not destroyed (Is. lxv. 8). Aphraates takes occasion of the great sufferings of the Persian Christians (August 345) in order to encourage his timid disciple and friend. He depicts for him the small number of the elect, and compares them to the solitary cluster on the vine, for whose sake the entire people, though an ungrateful vineyard, are spared by God, as the history of Israel from Adam to Jesus Christ makes manifest. Because of its historical contents Gennadius[1] called it a Chronicon. The other homilies are entitled: 1. On faith. 2. On love. 3. On fasts. 4. On prayer. 5. On wars, i. e. on the campaign of Sapor II., king of Persia, against Constantine the Great. 6. On the monks. 7 On penance. 8. On the resurrection of the dead, 9. On humility. 10. On the shepherds i. e. on the works and duties of the pastoral charge. 11. On circumcision. 12. On Easter. 13. On the sabbath. 14. On admonition, an encyclical letter composed by Aphraates at the suggestion of some otherwise unknown Council, possibly that of Seleucia-Ctesiphon (344) and incorporated with these instructions to his friend. 15. On the distinction of foods. 16. On the (Gentile) nations which have taken the place of the (Jewish) people. 17. On the proof of the Divine Sonship of Christ. 18. Against the Jews and on virginity and sanctity. 19. Against the contention of the Jews that they shall be brought together again. 20. On the support of the poor. 21. On persecution. 22. On death and the last things. — The style of Aphraates is clear and simple, but rather diffuse. The philological value of his writings is very great, they are of fundamental importance for Syriac syntax. His diction is throughout pure and original, uncontaminated by foreign words or phrases, above all free from Grecisms. — His Christological ideas are those of the Nicene Fathers, though his expression of them is wanting in precision. This is partly owing to the practical and ascetical tendency of his mind, but chiefly to his remoteness from the scene of Western ecclesiastical difficulties and to his ignorance of the Arian controversies. He touches very often on the sacraments of Penance and the Blessed Eucharist. In his writings a peculiar theory quite common among the later Nestorians of Syria frequently occurs viz. that during the period from the bodily death to the moment of resurrection the soul is in an unconscious or dormant condition[2].

[1] De viris ill., c. 1. [2] Hom., vi. 13; viii. 8.

3. LITERATURE. — *Nic. Antonelli,* S. Patris N. Iacobi episc. Nisibeni sermones, cum praefatione, notis et dissertatione de ascetis, Rome, 1756. *W Wright,* The Homilies of Aphraates, the Persian Sage, edited from Syriac manuscripts of the fifth and sixth centuries in the British Museum, with an English translation. Vol. i: The Syriac text, London, 1869; the promised English version never appeared. — *G. Bickell* published a German version of the Homilies 1—4 7 12 18 22, in Ausgewählte Schriften der syrischen Kirchenväter Aphraates, Rabulas und Isaak von Ninive, Kempten, 1874 (Bibl. der Kirchenväter), pp. 7—151. All the homilies were translated into German by *G. Bert,* Leipzig, 1888, in Texte und Untersuchungen, iii. 3—4. A new edition of the Syriac text, with a Latin version, was published by *J. Parisot,* in the Patrologia Syriaca I of Graffin (cf. § 80). *J. Parisot,* Aphraates: Dictionnaire de la Théologie Catholique, Paris, 1903, i. 1457—1463. Cf. *C. J. Fr. Sasse,* Prolegomena in Aphraatis Sapientis Persae sermones homileticos (Diss. inaug.), Leipzig, 1878. *J. M. Schönfelder,* Aus und über Aphraates, in Theol. Quartalschr. (1878), lx. 195—256 (i. e. the interpretation of the seventy weeks and the four empires of Daniel and the Christology of Aphraates). *J. Forget,* De vita et scriptis Aphraatis Sapientis Persae, dissertatio historico-theologica, Louvain, 1882. *S. Funk,* Die haggadischen Elemente in den Homilien des Aphraates, des persischen Weisen, Frankfort, 1891. *E. Hartwig,* Untersuchungen zur Syntax des Afraates, I. Die Relativpartikel und der Relativsatz (Inaug.-Diss.), Leipzig, 1893. *H. Hyvernat,* Aphraates, in Catholic University Bulletin, Washington, 1905, i. 314—318. *J. Labourt,* Le Christianisme et l'Empire perse sous la dynastie Sassanide (224—632), Paris, 1904. *Dom Connolly,* Aphraates and Monasticism, in Journal of Theol. Studies (1905), vi. 522—539. *F. C. Burkitt,* Aphraates and Monasticism, a reply, in Journal of Theol. Studies (1905), vii. 10—15. *Burkitt* treats of Aphraates and the Syriac versions of the Gospels, pp. 109—111 180—186, of his edition of the Evangelion Da Mepharreshe (2. vol.), Cambridge, 1904.

4. PAPA OF SELEUCIA. — A pretended correspondence of the Catholicus (patriarch) Papa of Seleucia (about 266—336) was edited in a German translation and minutely investigated by *O. Braun,* in Zeitschr. für kath. Theol. (1894), xviii. 163—182 546—565.

### § 82. St. Ephræm Syrus.

1. HIS LIFE. — The most important writer of the Syrian patristic age is Saint Ephræm (Ephraïm; very probably pronounced Afrêm by the Syrians). Much of his history is still obscure. The best accessible authorities, Syrian and Greek biographies and the confessions of the Saint (preserved only in Greek), are often mutually contradictory, and exhibit, in part at least, an undeniable legendary coloring. He was born at Nisibis in the reign of Constantine, therefore not earlier than 306. His parents were probably Christian and trained him from youth in the fear of the Lord. He resolved to devote himself without reserve to the divine service, and so chose the life of a hermit, dividing his time between study and prayer. His bishop, Jacob of Nisibis, who died probably in 338, placed much confidence in the young man, and is said to have taken him to the Council of Nicæa, and eventually to have made him head-master of the school of Nisibis. The latter city was besieged by Sapor II. in

the years 338, 346, and 350 on which occasions Ephræm displayed a holy zeal as counsellor and instructor of his fellow-citizens. The peace made by the emperor Jovinian in 363 with the king of Persia left Nisibis in the hands of the latter. Thereupon, following the example of the majority of the Christian inhabitants, Ephræm withdrew to Roman territory and took up his abode permanently at Edessa, in which city most of his writings were composed. He seems to have led a hermit's life on a mountain quite close to the city, whither, however, his disciples followed him and whence he came occasionally to preach in the city churches. There is grave reason to doubt the story that he visited Egypt and conversed with the monks of that land. On the other hand, it is certain that about 370 he travelled as far as Cæsarea in Cappadocia, in order to make the acquaintance of Basil the Great, then famous throughout the Christian world; it is said that he received deacon's orders from Basil, though he was probably never ordained to the priesthood. His death took place in 373, probably on June 9.

2. THE TRADITION OF HIS WRITINGS. — Ephræm left after him an extraordinary number of works. Several ancient writers assert that he composed commentaries on the entire Scripture. He also treated in metrical works a great many points of ecclesiastical doctrine and discipline. Sozomen heard[1] that Ephræm had written about three hundred myriads of lines: *τριακοσίας μυριάδας ἐπῶν.* Even in his lifetime these writings were looked on as highly authoritative. The Syrians called him the «eloquent mouth», the «prophet of the Syrians», the «doctor of the world», the «pillar of the Church», the «lyre of the Holy Spirit». Several of his hymns were adopted into the Syrian liturgies, Orthodox, Nestorian, and Jacobite. Comparatively few specimens of his prose-writings or Bible-commentaries have been saved. At a very early date his works were translated into Greek, Armenian, Coptic, Arabic and Ethiopic; these versions cover to some extent the gaps in the Syriac tradition of his writings, a tradition that was soon dimmed by the very splendor of his reputation. Many Syriac texts are erroneously attributed to Ephræm; many others exhibit some genuine fragments or kernels but overlaid by later foreign material. This is more particularly the case in the very numerous Greek versions, prepared with a view to the edification of contemporaries, for which reason the translators enlarged, abbreviated, cut up and re-arranged the Syriac text as seemed most suitable to them.

3. PROSE-WRITINGS OR BIBLE-COMMENTARIES. — His commentaries on Scripture were written in plain prose; his other writings, at least in the form exhibited by the Syriac original text, were with very

[1] Hist. eccl., iii. 16.

few exceptions written in metre. The original Syriac of only a few commentaries is known: Genesis, and Exodus (to xxxii. 26). His commentaries on the other biblical books are known to us only in fragments, e. g. short introductions and disjointed scholia. They have been gathered from an Old and New Testament Catena made in 851—861 by the monk Severus of Edessa out of the works of various Greek and Syriac writers. These fragmentary comments refer to Pentateuch, Josue, Judges, Samuel, Kings, Job and all the prophets, including Lamentations. The commentaries on Ruth, Paralipomenon, Esdras, Nehemias, Esther, the Psalms, Proverbs, Canticle of canticles and Ecclesiastes, seem to be lost in the original text. Though Ephræm is said to have written commentaries on the entire Scripture, we may well doubt whether this statement includes the deuterocanonical books of the Old Testament. Apparently none of Ephræm's Syriac commentaries on the New Testament have reached us. There are extant Armenian versions of his commentary on Paralipomenon, the Diatessaron of Tatian (§ 18, 3), and the Epistles of St. Paul (in this Armenian version no mention is made of the Epistle to Philemon); on the other hand, apropos of the commentary on Second Corinthians, there is added a commentary on the apocryphal correspondence between St. Paul and the Corinthians. The fragments of Ephræm's commentaries scattered through the Greek Catenae have not yet been collected by any investigator. — It is well-known that the N. T text which Ephræm comments is not the Syriac version of the Bible, known as the Peschittho (probably the equivalent of Vulgata); the Gospel-text was taken from the Diatessaron of Tatian. Ephræm lends a willing ear to Jewish traditions. It is highly probable, however, that he was ignorant of Hebrew and also of Greek. He does occasionally refer to the Hebrew text, and to the Septuagint version of the Old Testament, but he was probably dependent for his knowledge on marginal glosses of the Syriac version and on help orally given by competent scholars. Ephræm's method of exposition is excellent. As a rule he develops the ideas of the Antiochene school, particularly those of Theodoret of Cyrus. It is only rarely that he admits prophecies as directly Messianic; on the other hand, he is very unreserved in his acceptance of typical prophecies. His homilies and hymns are characterized by an extensive use of allegorism, both in interpretation and application.

4. METRICAL WRITINGS OR DISCOURSES AND HYMNS. — The metrical writings of Ephræm are extremely numerous; they are usually divided into homilies (Mêmrê, Mîmrê) and hymns or chants (Madrâschê). Even the homilies or discourses run into verse i. e. equi-syllabic lines, most frequently the seven-syllable line, usually known as the Ephræmic metre. In the hymns these lines are disposed in strophes of very unequal length, ranging from four to

twelve verses. Many hymns are also acrostichs. Rhyme is rarely attempted and then without attention to any fixed rules; usually not even the assonance is intentional. Formerly it was believed that Syriac metre was entirely based on the number of syllables. However, H. Grimme has lately demonstrated that it is verbal accent, the quality of the syllable, that dominates all Syriac metre, particularly that of Ephræm; likewise, as was already suspected by W Meyer, that the accentuation of Byzantine and later Latin poetry is owing to Syriac metrical influences. Ephræm is the greatest poet of Syria. The Syriac poetry, however, is generally feeble and prolix; hence Ephræm is frequently so diffuse as to weary the reader; he also repeats himself quite vexatiously. Certain of his more delicately-worked poems, like the elegiac verses and the funeral chants, abound in poetical thoughts and suggestions; he is also particularly touching and skilful in describing the felicity of divine faith and the love of God. In the Old Testament, however, as in a garden, he finds the loveliest flowers of poetry. Nöldeke says with truth that «we should appreciate more fully the splendor of S. Ephræm's verse, if we could acquire, even approximately, an intimate sense (ein lebendiges Sprachgefühl) of the language as then spoken in Syria». — The subjects of St. Ephræm's poetry are many, and are generally identical in both homilies and hymns. His moralizing discourses, monitory or penitential, make up the greater part of his works. Many of them seem to have been designed for public penitential processions, whence we may conclude that the latter were an institution of the Eastern churches long before they were introduced in the West. Another group of his discourses and hymns is dogmatico-apologetic or dogmatico-polemical in contents. They are addressed respectively to heathens, Jews and Manichæans, to Gnostics (Marcionites, Bardesanites), Novatians, Arians, Sabellians, and other kinds of heretics. He was no doubt moved to this by the fact that the metrical works of the earlier Syrian Gnostics, Bardesanes and his son Harmonius, had helped greatly to disseminate their heretical teachings throughout Syria (§ 25, 6). In 1865 Overbeck published four poems (Madrâschê) of Ephræm against Julian the Apostate. — Strictly doctrinal poems are rare in the works of Ephræm; dogmatic speculation is foreign to his mind; he very often speaks or sings of the dangers consequent on an over-curious scrutinizing of the mysteries of faith. Even in his apologetic and polemical poems, he is less of a doctrinaire exponent than of an exhortatory preacher, urging an acceptance in firm faith of the ecclesiastical teaching. Many of discourses and hymns on the feasts of our Lord and the Saints were first made known by Lamy (1882—1889). His praises of our Lord are entirely in accordance with the Nicene faith. He insists strongly on the true divinity, the perfect humanity, and on the uncommingled union of

the two natures. His harp resounds to the praises of Mary more frequently than that of any other poet or orator of Christian antiquity; he loves to sing of her stainless virginity, her truly divine maternity, her freedom from sin. In a poem of the year 370 he makes the Church of Edessa say to our Lord: Thou and Thy Mother are the only ones who are in every way perfectly beautiful, for in Thee, O Lord, is there no stain; no stain, also, in Thy Mother![1] Among his hymns on the Saints we may mention the verses in which he has immortalized his hermit friends, Abraham of Kidun and Julianus Saba. Many of his discourses are true homilies, being frequently based on biblical texts, chiefly those of the Old Testament. One of his poems deals in twelve books with the history of Joseph in Egypt. The so-called *Carmina Nisibena*, edited by Bickell in 1866, are most probably a collection made by Ephræm himself from his own numerous hymns. They deal with events in the siege of Edessa in 350 and during the Persian war (359—363) and in the lives of the bishop Jacob of Nisibis and others.

5. THE ROMAN EDITION OF THE WORKS OF SAINT EPHRÆM. SUPPLEMENT TO THE SAME. GERMAN VERSIONS. — The publication of the works of St. Ephræm has been in progress since the end of the fifteenth century. But there exists no single complete edition. The best hitherto is the Roman edition of 1732—1746 in six folio-volumes, three of which contain Syro-Latin and three Greco-Latin texts. It was brought out by the famous Maronite *Joseph Simon Assemani*, aided to some extent by *Peter Mobârek (Petrus Benedictus)*, S. J., and by *Stephen Evodius Assemani* (nephew of Joseph Simon). The Syriac texts used in this edition are taken, mostly, from manuscripts found in the monasteries of the Nitrian desert in Egypt; in these manuscripts there are several writings wrongly attributed to Ephræm. The Latin version is the work of the two above-mentioned collaborators of Assemani, it is very paraphrastic and in some places unreliable and arbitrary. The Greco-Latin volumes offer the text of Greek manuscripts not older than the tenth century, and reprinted without any critical examination; that such a critical study is necessary has been shown by *J. Gildemeister* in his controversy with Floss (§ 64, 4). — In the meantime the Roman edition has been variously supplemented and improved. — a) *Bible Commentaries:* Critical contributions to the text of the commentaries, entire or fragmentary, have been made by *A. Pohlmann*, S. Ephræmi Syri commentariorum in Sacram Scripturam textus in codicibus Vaticanis manuscriptus et in editione Romana impressus. Commentatio critica, parts 1 2, Brunsberg, 1862—1864. *Th. J. Lamy*, St. Ephræm Syri hymni et sermones, Malines, 1886, ii. 103—310, published new commentaries and fragments of commentaries by Ephræm taken from the Catena of Severus; *Lamy* also published, in the Revue Biblique (1897), vi. 380—395 535—546; (1898), vii. 89—97, a French version of the Scholia on the prophet Zacharias. The Mechitarists published at Venice 1836 (4 vols.) the commentaries extant in Armenian only (see no. 3). The commentary on the Diatessaron was translated into Latin by *J. B. Aucher* and published in this form by *G. Mösinger*, Venice, 1876 (cf. § 18, 3). *J. R. Harris*

[1] Carm. Nisib., n. 27, ed. *Bickell* 40.

published some Syriac fragments of the commentary on the Diatessaron, London, 1895; cf. *J. H. Hill,* A dissertation on the Gospel commentary of S. Ephræm the Syrian, Edinburgh, 1896. The Mechitarists have also made a Latin version of the commentary on the Epistles of St. Paul: S. Ephræm Syri commentarii in epistolas D. Pauli, nunc primum ex Armeno in Latinum sermonem a patribus Mekitharistis translati, Venice, 1893. The commentary on the apocryphal correspondence between St. Paul and the Corinthians, translated from Armenian into German, was edited by *P. Vetter,* Der apokryphe dritte Korintherbrief, Vienna, 1894, pp. 70 to 79. An Armenian «Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles compiled from the works of the ancient fathers Chrysostom and Ephræm« was published at Venice, 1839. In *Pohlmann* the reader will find an Arabic fragment of a commentary on Genesis and Exodus, bearing the name of Ephræm (l. c., i. 27 ff.). — b) *Discourses and hymns:* Apart from minor editions, new discourses and hymns have been published by *Overbeck, Bickell* and *Lamy:* S. Ephraemi Syri, Rabulae episc. Edesseni, Balaei aliorumque opera selecta. Primus edidit *J. J. Overbeck,* Oxford, 1865; he gives only the Syriac text; the promised Latin version never appeared. In the Zeitschr. f. kath. Theol. (1878), ii. 335—356, *G. Bickell,* published a version of the poems (3—20) against Julian the Apostate. The tractate against the Manichæans (59—73) was edited and translated into German by *K. Kessler,* in Mani, Berlin, 1889, i. 262—302. The letter to the «Brethren of the mountain» (the anchorites near Edessa, 113—131) was translated by *C. Kayser,* in Zeitschr. f. kirchl. Wissenschaft und kirchl. Leben (1884), v. 251—266. S. Ephraemi Syri Carmina Nisibena, additis prolegomenis et supplemento lexicorum syriacorum. Primus edidit, vertit, explicavit *G. Bickell,* Leipzig. 1866; *Bickell* added some Corrigenda in his Conspectus rei Syr. litt., Münster, 1871, pp. 28—34. S. Ephraem Syri hymni et sermones. Edidit, latinitate donavit, variis lectionibus instruxit, notis et prolegomenis illustravit *Th. J. Lamy,* Malines, 1882—1889, 3 vols.; cf. the review of the first two volumes of this work by *Th. Nöldeke,* in Gött. Gel. Anzeigen (Nov. 29., 1882), pp. 1505—1514 (and Febr. 1., 1887), pp. 81—87. In 1902 appeared a fourth volume of the work of *Lamy,* containing new hymns and discourses from manuscripts of Mount Sinai, Mossul, the Vatican and the British Museum. *J. Guidi,* La traduzione copta di un' omelia di Efrem (resembles the Greek text of the Roman edition, iii. 385), in Bessarione (1902—1903), vii. series II, iv. 1—21. Five of the fifteen hymns addressed to Abraham of Kidun (*Lamy,* iii. 749 to 836) had been already translated into German by *P. Martin,* in Zeitschrift f. kath. Theol. (1880), iv. 426—437. The hymn on the Maccabee brethren (*Lamy,* iii. 685—696) was re-edited in Syriac and English by *Bensly-Barnes,* The fourth Book of Maccabees, Cambridge, 1890, pp. 117 to 124, xliv—xlviii. S. Ephraemi carmina rogationum primus ed. vertitque latine *Ign. Ephr. Rahmani,* in Bessarione (1903), vii. 165—185; (1903 to 1904), viii. 1—13. The poem on Joseph in Egypt hitherto known only in fragments was published completely by *Bedjan,* St. Ephrem. Histoire complète de Joseph. Poème en 12 livres, 2. ed., Paris, 1891; the last two books are now to be found, in Syriac and Latin, in the fourth volume of Lamy. A homily on the pilgrim life was edited in Syriac and German by *A. Haffner,* Vienna, 1896. *C. P. Caspari* published (in Briefe, Abhandlungen und Predigten aus den zwei letzten Jahrhunderten des kirchlichen Altertums und dem Anfang des Mittelalters, Christiania, 1890, pp. 208—220) a very remarkable and interesting (Latin) sermon on Antichrist and the end of the world, attributed to Ephræm Syrus and Isidore of Seville. Caspari is of opinion (l. c., pp. 429 ff.) that the sermon was

not written before the year 600, while *W. Bousset,* Der Antichrist, Göttingen, 1895, pp. 21 ff., thinks it was composed in Greek about 373. *Duncan Jones,* A Homily of St. Ephrem, in Journal of Theol. Studies (1904), v. 546—552. — Great praise is due to *P. Zingerle* for his German versions of the writings of Ephræm. Apart from some minor publications he has edited two large collections: Ausgewählte Schriften des heiligen Kirchenvaters Ephräm, aus dem Griechischen und Syrischen übersetzt, Innsbruck, 1830—1838, 6 vols.; a new edition appeared in 1845—1846, in which volumes 4 and 5, entitled: «The Holy Muse of the Syrians» and «Hymns against the hair-splitters of the divine mysteries» present (German) metrical versions of the text of Ephræm. Ausgewählte Schriften des hl. Ephräm von Syrien, aus dem Syrischen und Griechischen übersetzt, Kempten, 1870—1876, 3 vols. (Bibl. der Kirchenväter). *C. Macke,* Hymnen aus dem Zweiströmeland. Dichtungen des hl. Ephrem des Syrers, aus dem syrischen Urtext metrisch ins Deutsche übertragen und mit erklärenden Anmerkungen versehen, Mainz, 1882. — A French version of the «Testament» of Ephræm was published by Lamy, in Compte rendu du IV^e^ Congrès scientifique international des Catholiques, Sect. I (Freiburg, 1898), pp. 173—209. *R. Duval,* Le testament de St. Ephrem, in Journal Asiatique, new series (1901), xviii. 234—419. A new recension of this text is found in *P. Bedjan,* Thomas von Marga: Liber superiorum etc., Paris and Leipzig, 1901. *E. Bouvy,* Les sources historiques de la vie de St. Ephrem, in Revue Augustinienne, 1903, févr., pp. 155—164.

6. WORKS CONCERNING ST. EPHRÆM. — *C. a Lengerke,* Commentatio critica de Ephraemo Syro S. Scripturae interprete, Halle, 1828; De Ephraemi Syri arte hermeneutica, Königsberg, 1831. *A. Haase,* S. Ephraemi Syri theologia, quantum ex libris poeticis cognosci potest, explicatur (Diss. inaug.), Halle, 1869. *P. de Lagarde,* Über den Hebräer Ephraims von Edessa (i. e. on the interpretation of Gen. i—xxxviii referred by Ephræm to a certain «Hebraeus»), in Orientalia, Göttingen, 1880, ii. *Th. J. Lamy,* Etudes de patrologie orientale: Saint Ephrem, in l'Université Catholique, new series (1890), iii. 321—349; (1890), iv. 161—190. *Lamy,* L'exégèse en Orient au IV^e^ siècle ou les commentaires de St. Ephrem, in Revue Biblique (1893), ii. 5—25 161—181 465—486. *Le Camus,* Saint Ephraim. Dictionnaire de la Bible, Paris, 1899, ii. 1889—1891. *F. C. Burkitt,* S. Ephraim's Quotations from the Gospel collected and arranged, in Texts and Studies, Cambridge, 1901, vii. 2, an important study for the separation of the genuine from the spurious in the manuscripts of the Ephræmic writings, and for the conclusion that the Peschittho of the New Testament is posterior to Ephræm and the works of Rabbulas of Edessa (§ 83, 4). *Burkitt* returns to this subject in his edition of the Evangelion Da Mepharreshe, Cambridge, 1904, ii. 112—149. *C. Eirainer,* Der hl. Ephräm der Syrer. Eine dogmengeschichtliche Abhandlung, Kempten, 1889. *H. Grimme,* Der Strophenbau in den Gedichten Ephräms des Syrers, Freiburg in Switzerland, 1893. Cf. *Grimme,* Grundzüge der Syrischen Betonungs- und Verslehre, in Zeitschr. der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft (1893), xlvii. 276—307. *Dom Connolly,* St. Ephraim and Eucratisus, in Journal of Theological Studies (1906), viii. 41—48.

### § 83. Later writers.

1. ACTS OF THE MARTYRS. — Several fourth-century Acts of Syrian martyrs have reached us, notably of the martyrs under Diocletian, Licinius and Sapor II. of Persia. Wright published (1865—1866) a Syriac martyrology of the year 411, at once the most ancient and

the most precious of all known martyrologies. In its first part it is dependent on a still older Greek source now lost. About 410 Maruthas, bishop of Maipherkat, collected the acts of the martyrs under Sapor II., and wrote a history of the Nicene Council.

*W. Wright's* edition (with English version) of the above-mentioned martyrology was published in the Journal of Sacred Literature, Oct. 1865 to Jan. 1866. For the Syriac text with a Latin version and a commentary cf. *G. B. de Rossi* and *L. Duchesne*, in Acta SS. Nov. ii. 1 (Brussels, 1894), l—lxix. Cf. *H. Achelis*, Die Martyrologien, Berlin, 1900, pp. 30—71. A school-edition was published by *H. Lietzmann*, Die drei ältesten Martyrologien, Bonn, 1903. The collection of Acts of the martyrs by bishop Maruthas was first brought out by *S. E. Assemani*, Acta Ss. Martyrum orientalium et occidentalium, Rome, 1748, 2 vols. The Syriac text is found in *P Bedjan*, Acta martyrum et sanctorum, Paris, 1891, ii. 57—396; on his history of the Nicene Council cf. *O. Braun*, De S. Nicaena synodo, Münster, 1898, in Kirchengeschichtl. Studien, iv. 3. Cf. *Harnack*, Der Ketzerkatalog des Bischofs Maruta von Maipherkat, Leipzig, 1899, in Texte und Untersuchungen xix, new series iv. 1 b. The work of *P. Bedjan*, Acta martyrum et sanctorum (Syriac acts of martyrs and lives of saints, untranslated) has already reached its seventh volume, Paris, 1890—1897; cf. *E. Nestle*, in Theol. Literaturzeitung, 1893, pp. 3—6 45—48 (on vols. i—iii); 1895, pp. 213—215 312—315 (on vols. iv—v); 1896, pp. 419 to 421 (on vol. vi).

2. CYRILLONAS. — The name of this writer has reached us only through six *Carmina* composed by him and preserved in a sixth-century manuscript of the British Museum. Bickell, their editor and translator, entitled them: A prayer for All Saints' feast of 396, concerning the plague of locusts and other afflictions, especially the invasions of the Huns; Hymn on the conversion of Zachæus; Hymn on the washing of feet; two Hymns on the Pascha Christi; a *Carmen* on wheat. Bickell says that after Ephræm this writer is the greatest of the Syriac poets.

*G. Bickell* published the Syriac text, in Zeitschr. der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft (1873), xxvii. 566—598; with corrections, ib. (1881), xxxv. 531—532; he had already translated the six hymns into German, in Ausgewählte Gedichte der syrischen Kirchenväter Cyrillonas, Balæus, Issak von Antiochien und Jakob von Sarug, Kempten, 1872, pp. 7—63, in Ausgewählte Schriften der syrischen Kirchenväter Aphraates, Rabulas und Isaak von Ninive, Kempten, 1874, he added (pp. 410—411) some notes on Cyrillonas, and (pp. 414—421) metrical excerpts from the writings of Cyrillonas.

3. BALÆUS. — Less attractive than the works of the foregoing writer, but very important from a dogmatico-historical point of view are the writings of the *chorepiscopus* or rural bishop Balæus (Balaj) edited by Overbeck (1865). The time and place of his labors are known with some certainty; thus he composed five panegyrical hymns on Asacius, bishop of Aleppo or Beroea (§ 74, 17) whom he calls «our father» and who died in 432. The longest of his

poems is one on the history of Joseph in Egypt, written in seven-syllable verse; it is, however, attributed by others to St. Ephræm (§ 82, 4). Most of his genuine metrical writings are in five-syllable verse, known as the Balæus-metre. His writings abound in evidences of ecclesiastical doctrine, notably concerning the Blessed Eucharist and the veneration and invocation of the Saints.

*J. J. Overbeck,* S. Ephraemi Syri, Rabulae episc. Edesseni, Balaei aliorumque opera selecta, Oxford, 1865, pp. 251—336 (untranslated). A selection of the Syriac works of Balæus was published in a German version by *G. Bickell,* Ausgewählte Gedichte etc., pp. 65—108; cf. *Bickell,* Ausgewählte Schriften etc., pp. 421—422. The Syriac original of a carmen De Faustino et de Metrodora (Mattidia) tribusque eius filiis, based on the story in the Clementine Recognitions (§ 26, 3) and lacking in Overbeck's edition, was published by *Bickell,* in Zeitschr. der deutschen morgenländ. Gesellschaft (1873), xxvii. 599—600, in Latin in Conspectus rei Syr. litt. 46, n. 5. — *K. V Zettensteen,* Beiträge zur Kenntnis der religiösen Dichtung Balais, nach den syrischen Handschriften des Britischen Museums, der Bibliothèque nationale in Paris und der königl. Bibliothek zu Berlin. The poem on the history of Joseph, known to Overbeck only in fragments (270—230), was published entire by *Bedjan* under the name of Ephræm (§ 82, 5).

4. RABBULAS OF EDESSA. — Rabbulas wrote also in metre, but his extant works are mostly in prose. His life is known to us in some detail and from rather trustworthy accounts. At the death of Diogenes, bishop of Edessa, in 412, Rabbulas was chosen his successor, and retained this office till his death (Aug. 7 or 8., 435). He was prominent in the Nestorian controversies, and at the Council of Ephesus took sides with the Antiochene party (§ 77, 2), but some time during the winter of 431 to 432 he withdrew from Nestorius, adhered to Cyril and thenceforth was very active in bringing about a reconciliation between the latter and the Antiochenes. He translated into Syriac also the Greek text of Cyril's *De recta fide ad Imperatorem* (§ 77, 4), and was especially active in the suppression of the writings of Theodore of Mopsuestia. Overbeck edited the greater part of his extant works; they deal with the discipline of the clergy and religious men and women, or are hymns written for the liturgy and the divine office (partly translations from the Greek); one sermon and some fragments of letters are also attributed to him. Though his other writings are in Syriac, the letters are written in Greek; in a panegyric on Rabbulas delivered at Edessa soon after 435, mention is made of a collection of these letters, 46 in number. It is a matter of regret that only fragments of them, in Syriac and Latin, have reached us.

The Syriac works or fragments of Rabbulas are found in *Overbeck,* l. c., pp. 210—248 362—378, the panegyric is published ib., pp. 159—209. The Syriac version of the De recta fide of Cyril, not found in Overbeck, was published by *Ph. Ed. Pusey,* Oxford, 1877 (§ 77, 9). In his Aus-

gewählte Schriften etc. *Bickell* translated (pp. 153—271) all the texts edited by Overbeck with the exception of a few hymns; he also added Latin fragments to the Syriac remnants of the correspondence of Rabbulas, and published, moreover, an account of the conversion of Rabbulas, taken from a life of St. Alexander, founder of the Acoimetae († ca. 430), and written about the middle of the fifth century. We have already said (§ 82, 6) that Burkitt interprets the statement of the biographer of Rabbulas (*Overbeck*, l. c., p. 172) that the latter translated the New Testament into Syriac as meaning that he is the author of the Peschittho version of the New Testament.

5. ST. ISAAC OF ANTIOCH. — The literary legacy of Isaac of Antioch, known also as Isaac the Great, is much more extensive, likewise more poetical in form. The details of his life are not known to us with sufficient certainty. He was probably born at Amida in Mesopotamia in the second half of the fourth century, but came in early youth to Edessa where he received instruction from a certain Zenobius, a disciple of Ephræm. He travelled much, and even visited Rome, after which he took up his residence at Antioch; Gennadius calls him[1] *presbyter Antiochenae ecclesiae,* while Syriac texts declare him an abbot of a monastery in the vicinity of Antioch. He died at an advanced age between 459 and 461. Zingerle was the first to make known some interesting pages from Isaac of Antioch; we owe to Bickell a complete edition of his writings. Most of them are in seven-syllable metre, some have reached us only in an Arabic version. By far the greater part of his works are ascetico-moral in character, exhortations to a life of virtue or reprobations of sin and vice; very often they are addressed directly to his fellow-monks. There are, however, some *Carmina* devoted to a very minute defence of articles of faith, especially the Trinity, the Incarnation, and free will. Others are found to be most valuable because of their incidental references to the contemporary wars with the Huns, the Arabs, and the Persians. There does not seem to be any reason to doubt his orthodoxy; two hymns, in which it is asserted that in Christ there is only one nature, were probably interpolated by Monophysite copyists. The following judgment of Bickell, quite in accord with that of Zingerle, applies to the literary merits of Isaac: «Apart from a few passages in which the sublimity of the subject-matter and personal inspiration lend to his speech a certain higher flight, he remains always languid, verbose and tedious. He is capable of so attaching himself to a given subject that he dwells upon it at great length and with the most wearisome tautology. It would seem at times as if he purposely avoided the pleasing and agreeable side of his theme in order to pursue some subordinate line of singular and bizarre thoughts.»

S. Isaaci Antiocheni, Doctoris Syrorum, opera omnia ex omnibus, quotquot exstant, codicibus manuscriptis cum varia lectione syriace arabi-

[1] De viris ill., c. 66.

ceque primus edidit, latine vertit, prolegomenis et glossario auxit *G. Bickell,* Giessen, part I, 1873; part II, 1877; these two volumes contain 37 hymns, or fragments of hymns, in Syriac and Latin. Six of them: De fide et incarnatione Domini (1), De fide (6), De potestate diaboli in homine tentando (10), De s. ieiunio quadragesimali (13), De ieiunio (14), De vigiliis Antiochenis et de eo quod bonum est confiteri Domino (15), were already known in a German version by *Bickell,* in his Ausgewählte Gedichte, pp. 109 to 191; cf. Ausgewählte Schriften, pp. 411—412 422—424. *P. Zingerle* published the Syriac text of the hymns De amore doctrinae (Monumenta Syriaca, Innsbruck, 1869, i. 13—20) and De pueris defunctis (Chrestomathia Syriaca, Rome, 1871, pp. 387—394), also extracts from the De crucifixione, De perfectione fratrum, De Adam et Eva, De Abelo et Caino (Chrestom. Syr. pp. 299—306 395—416). He made known, also in a German version, extracts from six hymns on the Crucifixion, in Theol. Quartalschr. (1870), lii. 92—114. All the texts published by *Zingerle* have not been published in the *Bickell* editions. Some poems of Isaac were wrongly attributed to St. Ephræm in the Roman edition of his works (§ 82, 5). Isaac, syrus antiochenus. Homiliae ed. *P. Bedjan* (Syriac), Leipzig, 1903, i. *M. Besson,* Un recueil de sentences attribué à Isaac le Syrien, in Oriens Christianus (1901—1902), i. 288—298. Our Isaac must not be confounded with Isaac, bishop of Ninive and anchorite in the seventh century, author of several ascetical sermons preserved in the original Syriac and in Greek and Latin versions (*Migne,* PG., lxxxvi 1, 811—886), also in an unreliable Arabic version, and an Ethiopic version derived from the same. — For Isaac of Ninive cf. *J. B. Chabot,* De S. Isaaci Ninivitae scriptis et doctrina, Louvain, 1892.

## THIRD SECTION.

# LATIN WRITERS.

### § 84. General conspectus.

1. THE ROLL OF THE CHRISTIAN WEST IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF DOGMA. — The great trinitarian and christological conflicts that had been fought out principally on Oriental soil (§ 60, 2), could not fail to affect the Western Church. One of her most eminent writers, Hilary of Poitiers, found the work of his life precisely in the refutation of Arianism. There comes now to the surface, however, and much more markedly, a distinction already noticed (§ 49) between the intellectual temperament of the East and that of the West. The Western Christian is less concerned with a speculative grasp of the idea of God than with the practical duty of man. During this whole period only one noteworthy doctrinal conflict broke out in the Western Church; it concerned the necessity of divine co-operation with the personal efforts of man to attain his last end. It is, therefore, ecclesiastical anthropology, that is developed and cultivated in this period, in opposition to Pelagianism and Semipelagianism. In addition, the nature and constitution of the Church became an object of frequent discussion and exposition apropos of the Novatian and Donatist schisms.

2. THEOLOGICAL SCHOOLS AND TENDENCIES. — The above-mentioned Hilary does not fear to lose his independence and originality of thought by drawing on Greek sources in defence of the Christian faith. His writings may rightly be described as a channel through which the approved results of Oriental Christian theology were made accessible to the West. At a later date a similar role fell to St. Jerome and Rufinus, as mediators between the Greek and the Latin theology. The former is certainly the most intellectual and erudite among the Western Christian writers. Like Rufinus, once his friend and later his enemy, he is especially interested in biblico-historical questions, while the strength of St. Hilary lies all in dogmatic speculation. These three authors to whom we might add Marius Mercator and John Cassian, have been called, not without reason, the «Grecizing Westerns.» — Specifically Western and untrammelled by Oriental thought is the position taken by Ambrose, Augustine and Leo the Great. It is highly illustrative of this mental attitude that Ambrose, following in the steps of Cicero, should be the first to attempt a complete exposé of the teachings of Christian morality as apart from Christian faith. At the same time, in exegesis also Ambrose followed Greek models and even passed through Origen and Hippolytus back to the Jew Philo, it is also true that in dogmatic exposition this «Emperor among the bishops of the West» sought his model in St. Basil the Great, a man quite akin to him in character and mental bent. — In the person of the African Augustine theological supremacy, even in the province of speculation, was transferred from the East to the West. In Pelagianism and Semipelagianism, Augustine found himself confronted by quite new questions amid the difficulties of which his incomparably acute and profound spirit had to clear a way for itself. He breathed a new life into nearly all branches of ecclesiastical science, labored at them with creative vigor, and set before them new tasks and aims. — Leo I. bears rightly not only the title of the «Great» pope, but also that of «Doctor of the Church». Quite worthy of the mighty energy with which he governed and directed the ecclesiastical situation of his time is the intellectual pre-eminence which he held throughout the Eutychian or Monophysite conflict. — A specifically theological school appears early in the fifth century in the newly founded monasteries on the Isle of Lerins and in the vicinity of Marseilles. Its bond of union is a common opposition to the teaching of Augustine, i. e. Semipelagianism, to call it by its later name. The most remarkable theologians of this school are John Cassian and Vincent of Lerins.

3. THEOLOGICAL LITERATURE. — *Apologetic:* It is only natural that henceforth the Latin apologetic literature of the Christians should quit the defensive and assume rather an aggressive character (§ 60, 4). Firmicus Maternus attacks the mysteries of the pagans. Ambrose

and Prudentius denounce the last manifestations of decadent heathenism in public life and the pretentions of the old Roman senatorial element under the leadership of Symmachus. Augustine and Orosius refute the charge that the miseries of the present ceaseless horrors of war, and the collapse of the empire, are the results of Christianity. The reply of Augustine to these reproaches is the great and noble work on the City of God, the first attempt at a philosophy of history. It is Augustine again who leads the Christian defence against the Manichæans, doubly qualified for this office by reason of the long years (374—383) that he had spent in the service of Mani. Several Spanish writers refute the heresy of Priscillian which is close akin to Manichæism — among them Prudentius (?), and besides them Augustine, at the suggestion of the Spaniard Orosius. — *Polemic and systematic theology:* We have already seen that the refutation of Arianism in the West and the exposition of Catholic doctrine concerning the Trinity fell to the lot of Hilary of Poitiers. Other participants in the conflict were Lucifer of Calaris, Phöbadius of Agennum, Ambrose and Augustine. John Cassian and Marius Mercator wrote against Nestorianism, Leo the Great against Monophysitism. Pacianus of Barcelona and Ambrose defended the power of the keys against its persistent denial by Novatianism. The great and perilous schism of the Donatists in Africa called forth the efforts of Optatus of Mileve and Augustine, who made clear the essential elements of the Church and the objective efficacy of the sacraments. The most important and most difficult problem of Western polemical theology is connected with the name of the British monk Pelagius. The refutation of Pelagian naturalism earned for Augustine the immortal title of *Doctor gratiae*. He was bravely aided by Jerome, Orosius and Marius Mercator. The doctrine of Augustine was attacked by the Semipelagians, but found well-equipped defenders in Prosper of Aquitaine and the anonymous author of the *De vocatione omnium gentium*. At this period we meet, in both East and West, with very few attempts at a systematized theology; Augustine wrote a compendium of ecclesiastical doctrine, Vincent of Lerins a precise exposition of the Church's rule of faith, i. e. the principle of tradition. — *Biblical theology:* It is to St. Jerome that we owe the best work in this province. He alone among all the Western theologians understands, and understands profoundly, the Hebrew tongue. He gave to the Western Church a translation of the Holy Scriptures, which is far superior to all previous attempts of the kind. Biblical Introduction and Biblical Archæology are also deeply indebted to him. On the other hand, his abundant commentaries on many books of the Old and New Testament fall below our just expectations; they were, for the most part, written hastily and exhibit repeatedly a lack of clear and correct hermeneutic principles. Other ecclesiastical exegetes are Hilary of

Poitiers, Ambrose and Augustine, all of whom cherish the allegorical method of interpretation. And though on this point the Latin and the Greek exegesis are in accord, there is a characteristic difference: the Latins, and particularly Ambrose, are usually hortatory, while among the Greeks it is the doctrinal point of view that predominates. Augustine made also a notable contribution to Gospel-criticism in his work *De consensu evangelistarum*. Biblical geography was illustrated by the authors of the *Itinerarium a Burdigala Hierusalem usque* and the *Peregrinatio ad loca sancta*. The Donatist Tichonius and Eucherius of Lyons established principles for the interpretation of the figurative expressions of Holy Scripture. A comprehensive theory of biblical hermeneutics is found in the *De doctrina christiana* of Augustine. — *Historical theology:* In this department the Latins accomplished much less than the Greeks. Jerome translated into Latin and continued the second part of the Chronicle of Eusebius. Similarly, Rufinus paraphrased and continued the Church History of Eusebius. The Chronicle of St. Jerome was continued by Prosper of Aquitaine. Sulpicius Severus wrote a well-known history from the Creation to A. D. 400. Less important, though covering more ground, is the work of the Spanish priest Orosius. Philastrius and Augustine (De haeresibus) wrote histories of heresies. Jerome composed the first history of Christian literature. The same writer compiled edifying biographies, as did Sulpicius Severus, Rufinus and Paulinus of Milan. — *Practical theology:* There is now a great abundance of ascetico-moral literature; the best writers in this department are Ambrose, Jerome and Augustine. We have already mentioned the manual of Christian morality drawn up by Ambrose; it was specially destined for the clergy. John Cassian wrote two ascetical works for the edification of monks. Augustine prepared the first manual of homiletics in the fourth book of his *De doctrina christiana* and the first manual of Catechetics in his work *De catechizandis rudibus*. He is also the chief master of practical pulpit eloquence. For copiousness of thought and force of logic, he has never been surpassed, though Ambrose reaches a higher level of oratorical sublimity and brilliancy. After these masters of oratory, Leo the Great, Peter Chrysologus, and Maximus of Turin merit a place among the great Christian preachers.

4. THEOLOGICAL LITERATURE (CONTINUED). POETRY — The Latins, like the Syrians, are far more productive in the field of Christian poetry than the Greeks. Didactic poems, after the manner of Commodian, the first Christian poet, were written by Prudentius, Paulinus of Nola, Augustine, Prosper of Aquitaine, Orientius, and others; among them Prudentius has always been recognized as a master. Still greater is the number of poets who attempted to excel in the epic properly so-called. Proba tried to put the entire biblical

history into a Cento; Cyprian of Gaul, Claudius Marius Victor (Alethia), the authors of the poems *De Sodoma, De Jona, De martyrio Maccabaeorum* and others treat Old Testament themes; Juvencus, Sedulius *(Paschale carmen)* and others take up the life of our Lord. Pope Damasus, Prudentius, Paulinus of Nola left panegyrical poems on Christ and the Saints. This Christian Latin poetry is based on the old Roman epic, and follows closely the laws of its technic; it offers nothing new except the subject-matter and the personal treatment of the same. It is otherwise with the lyric poetry that begins henceforth to flourish among Latin Christians, or the peculiarly new species of poetic form known as the hymn. Poems of this kind, distinguished for boldness and sublimity of thought as well as for depth and tenderness of sentiment, were written by Hilary of Poitiers, Ambrose, Prudentius and Sedulius. All this lyric poetry in its inmost nature is a flower of Christian life, however attired it may be in the antique poetical forms in the beginning. It could never have grown on a heathen soil because the conditions were wanting, notably moral purity and solidity of religious conviction. During this period, both among Latins and Greeks, we perceive the beginning of an entirely new form of poetical activity. The popular ecclesiastical poetry frees itself gradually from the bonds of antiquated metrical laws, and takes refuge in rhythmic versification based on the accentuation of certain words. The first Latin poem in which the arsis of the verse is placed on accentuated syllables is the *Psalmus contra partem Donati* of Augustine.

### § 85. Firmicus Maternus.

Julius Firmicus Maternus is the name, vouched for by the only extant manuscript (cod. Vaticano-Palatinus, saec. x.), of the author of a work *De errore profanarum religionum* in which the emperors Constantius (337—361) and Constans (337—350) are urged to deal a death blow to decadent heathenism. Our knowledge of the author is confined to what we can glean from the solitary manuscript of his work, mutilated moreover at the beginning, where the two outer leaves of the first quaternio are wanting. It was very probably composed about 347, if we are to judge from the reference (c. 29, 3) to the illsuccess of the Persians in their war against Rome, it is also possible that the vicinity of Henna in Sicily was the home or residence of the author, at least he shows a rather exact knowledge of that place. There is a growing inclination to attribute the work to a certain Julius Firmicus Maternus Junior Siculus, author of a heathen astrological work entitled Mathesis; since Mommsen settled the date of this latter heathen compilation, the above-mentioned view is gaining ground. A very strong argument in favor of identity of authorship is found in the striking similarity of style. We should

have to suppose, of course, that after the composition of his pagan work (334—337) Firmicus Maternus was converted to the Christian religion. The Christian work is a direct attack on the «mysteries» in which heathenism was making its last stand; the crass superstition and the unnatural immorality often exhibited in them are laid bare (cc. 6—17). The author attempts to prove that the pass-words, *signa vel symbola,* by which the initiated recognized one another, are only diabolical imitations of biblical expressions, more particularly of the sayings of the prophets (cc. 18—27). At the end (cc. 28 29) the duty of both emperors is laid down with emphatic appeals to the old Testament: they must root out the remnants of heathenism; in return God will reward them by new proofs of His mercy, which has otherwise been so largely vouchsafed to them because of their faith. The little work exhibits a certain fanaticism, and does not hesitate to urge violent measures. Nevertheless, the author is concerned for the true interest of the heathens: once the sick man is restored to health, he recognizes gratefully the useful character of remedies otherwise disagreeable and painful (c. 16, 4—5). The heathenism of the fourth century was probably never described in a more true and reliable manner than in this work. From a dogmatico-historical point of view, the long passage on the Blessed Eucharist (c. 18) is especially important. The style of the work is very lively and emphatic, and the diction quite pure, though not free from plebeian expressions.

The famous Codex Vaticano-Palatinus is described by *A. Reifferscheid,* Bibl. Patrum Lat. Italica, i. 268—269. The first edition is that of *M. Flacius Illyricus,* Strassburg, 1562, often reprinted with more or less exactness; it is found also in *Gallandi,* Bibl. vet. Patr., v. 21—39, and in *Migne,* PL., xii. 971—1050. New editions based on fresh collations of the Codex are due to *C. Bursian,* Leipzig, 1856, and *C. Halm,* Vienna, 1867 (Corpus script. eccles. lat. ii). Cf. *Cl. H. Moore,* Julius Firmicus Maternus, der Heide und der Christ (Inaug.-Diss.), Munich, 1897. A new edition of the pagan work (a complete theory of astrology) was undertaken by *W. Kroll* and *F. Skutsch:* Julii Firmici Materni Matheseos libri viii, fasc. i, Leipzig, 1897. For the date of composition of this latter work cf. *Th. Mommsen,* in Hermes (1894), xxix. 468 ff., and *Moore,* l. c., pp. 2 ff. *C. Weyman,* l'astrologie dans le De errore de Firmicus (c. 17, 1), in Revue d'hist. et de littérat. religieuses (1898), iii. 383—384. *A. Becker,* Julius Firmicus Maternus und Pseudo-Quintilian, in Philologus, new series (1902), xv. 476—478.

### § 86. St. Hilary of Poitiers.

1. HIS LIFE. The Arian discords were far-reaching enough to disturb profoundly even the Western Church. Jerome could write apropos of the results of the double synod of Seleucia-Rimini (359): Ingemuit totus orbis et Arianum se esse miratus est[1]. When Arianism,

[1] Alterc. Lucif. et orthod., c. 19.

or rather Semiarianism, was at the acme of its career, a brilliant star arose in Gaul and began to diffuse its sweet and tranquil light amid the storms of that sad time; this was St. Hilary of Poitiers, a theologian of wonderful profundity of thought, of cogent and forcible diction, but also gentle and affectionate in sentiment and of kingly courage. He is often called «the Athanasius of the West», a title that belongs more appropriately to Hosius of Cordova (§ 87, 1). Certainly Hilary was one of the principal instruments of divine Providence in the extirpation of Arianism from Gaul, and in the preservation of the true Christian faith. Born of a noble heathen family of Poitiers (Pictavi in Aquitania), probably between 310 and 320, he devoted all his attention from childhood to the study of Latin and Greek. As he grew up, it seemed to him that the heathen philosophy furnished no sufficient answer to the problem of human destiny; it was almost by accident that he was led to the Holy Scriptures wherein he was to find the object of his longing. In the opening lines of his greatest work[1] he has discussed the manner in which he was made to see the truth and become a Christian. It is probable that shortly after his baptism, which he did not long delay, the clergy and people of Poitiers chose him unanimously for their bishop. By the year 355 he had been a bishop already for some time (aliquantisper)[2]. Though he did not take part in the synod of Milan (355) at which the emperor Constantius effected in so harsh and despotic a way the condemnation of Athanasius, he was destined to suffer the consequences of this step. Saturninus, bishop of Arles, an Arian sympathizer, was desirous of profiting by this victory in order to consolidate in Gaul the standing of Arianism. He found in Hilary a vigorous opponent and a man capable of rallying around the standard of orthodoxy all the right-minded bishops of Gaul; they renounced the communion of the Arians. Saturninus replied by accusing Hilary and his friends of political intrigues against the emperor. The mendacious report of a synod convoked by Saturninus at Biterrae (Béziers in Languedoc), in the spring of 356, caused the emperor to banish Hilary from Gaul to Asia Minor. He was allowed, however, to retain a certain personal freedom, and seems to have spent most of his exile in Phrygia. Here he became more thoroughly acquainted with the writings of the Greek Fathers, through the study of which his powers of speculative thought rapidly matured. It was in this exile that he wrote the most important of his works; he also found there the inspiration for his hymns. In 359 he assisted at the synod of Seleucia Aspera, the provincial capital of Isauria; thence he accompanied to Constantinople the deputies of the synod. The Arians now caused him to be sent home to Gaul as «a disturber

[1] De trin., i. 1 ff. [2] De syn., c. 91.

of the peace of the East»: quasi discordiae seminarium et perturbator Orientis redire ad Gallias iubetur, absque exilii indulgentia[1]. Early in 360 he returned to his fatherland by way of Italy and was everywhere received with great joy. His immediate concern was the healing of the grave wounds inflicted on the Church of Gaul, chiefly by Saturninus. Many bishops had accepted the Arian creed either through ignorance or through fear; the mild and considerate policy of Hilary made it easy for them to return to the Catholic fold. At the national council of Paris (361), that had been preceded by several provincial councils, he was able to unite nearly all the bishops of Gaul on the basis of the Nicene Creed and to bring about the deposition of Saturninus. Sulpicius Severus closes his account of this event with the following words: Illud apud omnes constitit unius Hilarii beneficio Gallias nostras piaculo haeresis liberatas[2]. The influence of the great bishop was felt even throughout Italy He presided over the synod of Milan in 364, at which there was question of the orthodoxy of Auxentius, the Arian bishop of that city. The latter, however, was able to deceive the emperor Valentinian, and Hilary was compelled to quit Milan. He died in his native city «in the sixth year after his return»[3], i. e. in the year 366. Posterity has been unanimous in its admiration for this great Christian. St. Jerome, writing in 384, sums up in the following words[4] the judgment of his contemporaries: «The merit of his confession (of the faith), the activity of his life, and the splendor of his eloquence will be celebrated wherever the name of Rome is heard (ubicumque Romanum nomen est).

2. HIS WORK DE TRINITATE. THE STYLE OF ST. HILARY — The principal work of our author is entitled: *De trinitate libri* xii[5], a superscription current since the sixth century; the original title was: *De fide* or *De fide adversus Arianos*. The work was composed during 356—359 in Asia Minor; its purpose is to define and establish in a scientific way against Arianism the ecclesiastical teaching concerning the God-Man. In the first book are set forth the necessity and the happiness of a true knowledge of God; then follows a summary of all twelve books. The second book takes as its basis the baptismal formula and describes the mystery of the divine generation of the Son: sacramentum edocet divinae generationis (i. 21). In the third book he undertakes to illustrate, apropos of John x. 38: ego in Patre et Pater in me, the consubstantiality of the Son and the Father. The following four books attack the teachings of the heretics and refute their objections against the divinity of the Son. In the eighth book he proves that the dogma of monotheism is not affected by the recognition of the Son of God: octavus liber totus

[1] *Sulp. Sev.*, Chron., ii. 45, 4. [2] Ib., ii. 45, 7. [3] Ib., ii. 45, 9.
[4] Ep. 34, 3. [5] *Migne*, PL., x. 25—472.

in unius Dei demonstratione detentus est (i. 28). The ninth book refutes the objection of the heretics against the eternal birth of the Son from the Father: nonus liber totus in repellendis iis quae ad infirmandam Unigeniti Dei nativitatem (not: divinitatem) ab impiis usurpantur, intentus est (i. 29). The tenth book undertakes to reconcile with Christian faith in the true divinity of the Son the evidences of pain on the part of Christ; the eleventh book treats of the subordination of Christ referred to in John xx. 17 and 1 Cor. xv. 27—28. In the twelfth book, finally, he undertakes to illustrate as far as human reason may do, how completely different is the eternal birth of the Son from that of any temporal being. The entire work is a sustained and intensely enthusiastic plea for the faith of the Church. In the domain of early ecclesiastical literature it is certainly the most imposing of all the works written against Arianism. It is true that he bases his arguments on the speculative thought of the Greek Fathers, but he does not, therefore, cease to be a writer of independence and originality. He was the first to act as an intermediary between the theology of the East and that of the West; thereby he contributed to the latter many new germs of thought and method the influence of which was afterwards visible in the admirable development of Latin theology. The peculiarities of his christological doctrine will be touched on below (no. 6). Hilary paid very great attention to the literary finish of his work. In the prayer for divine aid with which the first book (i. 38) closes he says: Tribue ergo nobis verborum significationem, intelligentiae lumen, dictorum honorem, veritatis fidem. His diction is always pithy and dignified. In his judgment on the style of the great bishop of Poitiers, Jerome betrays[1] e certain narrowness: «Saint Hilary», he says, «paces solemnly along clothed in the Gallic buskin, he adorns himself with the flowers of Hellas and frequently becomes involved in his long periods; hence he is a writer not at all suited to the needs of the less cultured among our brethren». What lends a certain solemnity and sublimity to the language of Hilary is not a love of rhetorical pomp, but the sincerity and warmth of his convictions. Robust vigor and a stout unyielding heart, intellectual force and solidity of character are visible all through his work. If we miss in his style the qualities of delicacy and grace, their absence is amply compensated for by his powerful personality and his charming originality. It is true that the average reader of Hilary finds his language difficult, but this, however, is to be attributed not to obscurity of style, but to the depth and the boldness of the ideas he is expressing.

3. HISTORICO-POLEMICAL WRITINGS. — He was often compelled, like Athanasius, to defend the truth of history against the falsifications

[1] Ep. 58, 10.

and misrepresentations of Arian writers. In the first treatise addressed (355) to the emperor Constantius (Ad Constantium Augustum, lib. i.)[1] he defended with the eloquence of a clear conscience his political innocence from the malicious insinuations of Saturninus and his fellow-Arians. In a memorial addressed (360) to the same emperor (Ad Constantium Augustum, lib. II)[2], he petitioned for an audience with the ruler of the Roman world in the presence of Saturninus; he offered to compel the latter to confess then and there his mendacity and his intrigues (ad confessionem falsorum quae gessit, c. 3). His confidence in the emperor was soon shaken, the latter turned a willing ear to the Arians alone. Hilary gave vent to the pain and wrath of his soul in an attack on the emperor (Contra Constantium)[3], written at Constantinople in 360, but not published until after the death of the emperor (Nov. 3., 361). It is at once a cry of anguish and a note of alarm forced from the depths of his spirit by the imminent peril of the faith. In the very first chapters (cc. 1 ff.) he denounces Constantius as Antichrist; later on he compares him to Nero, Decius and Maximian (cc. 7 ff.). When Constantius convoked the double synod of the East at Seleucia and of the West at Rimini, Hilary wrote in the spring of 359 his: *De synodis seu De fide Orientalium*[4] It is addressed primarily to the Western bishops, but is meant likewise for their brethren in the East, its object being to ensure harmonious co-operation of all defenders of the Nicene Creed during the impending synods. Hilary saw in the ignorance of the Western bishops concerning the history of the Eastern synods since the gathering at Nicæa (325) the chief cause of the existing tension; he, therefore, describes at length what took place in the subsequent synods. Many other letters of St. Hilary written during his exile to the bishops of Gaul are lost[5]. He was obliged to defend the conciliatory letter just described from the attacks of the quarrelsome Lucifer, bishop of Calaris (§ 87, 2), this he did in a special work that is now known to us only through insignificant fragments: Apologetica ad reprehensores libri de synodis responsa[6]. — In his memorial to the bishops of Italy (365): Contra Arianos vel Auxentium Mediolanensem[7], he warns them not to hold communion with the latter. Jerome mentions[8] two polemical works of Hilary that have not reached us: Liber adversum Valentem et Ursacium, historiam Ariminensis et Seleuciensis synodi continens, and: Ad praefectum Sallustium sive contra Dioscorum. The: *Fragmenta* (15) *ex opere historico*[9], which the defenders of their authenticity usually describe as remnants of the first mentioned of these two works, are, with the exception of

[1] *Migne,* PL., x. 557—564. [2] Ib., x. 563—572.
[3] Ib., x. 577—606. [4] Ib., x. 479—546. [5] De syn., c. 1.
[6] *Migne,* PL., x. 545—548. [7] Ib., x. 609—618.
[8] De viris ill., c. 100. [9] *Migne,* PL., x. 627—724.

the first fragment, probably spurious in their entirety. Of the second of these works Jerome says[1]: Hilarius brevi libello, quem scripsit contra Dioscorum medicum, quid in litteris possit, ostendit.

4. EXEGETICAL WRITINGS. — Hilary is a pioneer in the field of scholarly exegesis in the West. Before him the Western Church possessed but few commentators: Victorinus of Pettau, Reticius of Autun (§ 58), and Fortunatianus of Aquileia[2]. The commentaries of the rhetorician Marius Victorinus belong probably to a later period (§ 87, 8). The earliest work of St. Hilary is a commentary on Matthew[3], composed about 355, at a time when he had not yet become involved in the Arian conflict. The textual exposition is based on the theory that all Scripture offers a prophetic or typical character: typica ratio xvii. 8, xix. 1; causae interiores xii. 12; caelestis intelligentia xx. 2. It is the duty of the commentator to recognize and set forth this profounder meaning of the sacred text. Hilary does not consider it necessary to treat of the historico-grammatical meaning, nor does he take into consideration the Greek text of the Scripture. Somewhat different is his attitude in the commentary on the Psalms: Tractatus super Psalmos[4], written probably in the last years of his life. It is always the celestial sense, the prophetic contents of the text, that he aims at disengaging from the letter; nevertheless he recognizes the claims of the literal sense, and frequently compares various Greek and Latin translations. He also makes mention of earlier commentators[5]. When St. Jerome remarks[6] that Hilary imitated Origen, but added something of his own, he is certainly unjust to the former. It is very probable that this commentary once included all the Psalms, but in the shape in which it was known to St. Jerome the commentary treated only of Psalms 1 2 51—62 118—150. The later editions (Migne, Zingerle) offer commentaries on Psalms 1 2 9 13 14 51—69 91 118—150, also an appendix of fragmentary or spurious treatises on some other Psalms. Both these commentaries of Hilary were highly esteemed in later ages and contributed greatly to spread throughout the West the allegorizing method in the interpretation of Scripture. Only two small fragments[7] are extant of his *Tractatus in Job,* which was according to St. Jerome[8] only a translation of *Origen.* St. Jerome had also heard[9] from others of the existence of a commentary of Hilary on the Canticle of canticles. Some modern writers, trusting to later indications, attribute to Hilary a (lost) commentary on the Pauline Epistles. The *Liber mysteriorum* cited by St. Jerome[10] belongs, according to the fragments published by Ga-

[1] Ep. 70, 5. [2] *Hier.,* De viris ill., c. 97; Comm. in Matth., praef.
[3] *Migne,* PL., ix. 917—1078. [4] Ib., ix. 231—908.
[5] Instr., c. 1; In Ps. liv. 9; In Ps. cxxiv. 1.
[6] De viris ill., c. 100; cf. Ep. 61, 2. [7] *Migne,* PL., x. 723—724.
[8] De viris ill., c. 100. [9] Ib. [10] Ib.

murrini in 1887, to the exegetical writings; it must have been a treatise on prophetical types of the Old Testament and not a liturgy, as was formerly thought. Mai published in 1852 treatises on the beginning of the first and the beginning of the fourth Gospels, also on the man sick of the palsy[1], though attributed to Hilary, they are spurious.

5. HYMNS OF HILARY — St. Jerome says[2] that Hilary composed a hymn-book (Liber hymnorum), and according to St. Isidore of Seville[3] he was the first to excel in the composition of hymns: hymnorum carmine floruit primus. In the eleventh-century manuscript whence Gamurrini took his fragments of the «Book of Mysteries» (see no. 4), there are remnants of the «Book of Hymns» i. e. of three hymns, in an incomplete and mutilated condition. All three hymns celebrate the redemption of the human race by the God-Man. The second hymn is not, as Gamurrini imagined, composed by a woman, but rather by Hilary for a woman. Each of the three hymns exhibits a distinct metre; the first two are in acrostichs i. e. each strophe begins with a letter of the alphabet; errors of prosody abound. Other hymns have long been current under the name of Hilary, e. g. the lovely morning song *Lucis largitor splendide,* and the vesper song *Ad caeli clara non sum dignus sidera.* Their genuineness, however, has been much disputed. In any case the discovery of Gamurrini shows that one must not ask from St. Hilary too rigorous an adhesion to the fixed rules of classic prosody. Hilary caught from the Greeks of Asia Minor his love of hymns; for he had frequent occasion during his exile to hear the hymns of the Christians sung in their churches. His hymns (either all, or some) were written for the public liturgical service, a fact quite reconcilable with the opinion of Christian antiquity that made St. Ambrose the father of Christian hymns in the West (§ 90, 8). After all, the efforts of Hilary to introduce the hymn-service proved almost fruitless; he was obliged to admit[4] that his fellow-citizens of Gaul were not desirous of knowing more about his hymns: in hymnorum carmine indociles.

6. CHRISTOLOGICAL DOCTRINE. — The writings of Hilary are dominated by one leading thought: the defence and illustration of the faith of Christians in the divinity of Jesus Christ. He looks upon this doctrine as the very corner-stone of the Church[5]: Haec fides ecclesiae fundamentum est, per hanc fidem infirmes adversus eam sunt portae inferorum, haec fides regni coelestis habet claves[6]. In his speculative argument he dwells with especial interest on the eternal generation of the Son by the Father: Quis dubitat quin indifferentem naturam nativitas consequatur? Hinc enim est sola

[1] Mt. ix. 2 ff. [2] De viris ill., c. 100. [3] De eccl. off., i. 6.
[4] *Hier.,* Comm. in Gal., lib. ii., init. [5] Mt. xvi. 13 ff.
[6] De trin., vi. 37.

illa quae vere esse possit aequalitas[1]. The unity of the divine nature is not affected by the personal properties of fatherhood and sonship respectively, for they are essentially connected with the act of generation: Licet paternae nuncupationis proprietas differat, tamen natura non differt: natus enim a Deo Deus non dissimilis est a gignente substantia[2]. Though the Son is God from all eternity, He became man in time: Hunc igitur assumpsisse corpus et hominem factum esse perfecta confessio est ut sicut Dei filium, ita et filium hominis meminerimus: quia alterum sine altero nihil spei tribuit ad salutem[3]. He often reminds his readers that God the Son took the two essential elements of our human nature, a body and a soul: Naturam in se universae carnis assumpsit[4]; nostri corporis atque animae homo[5]; carnis atque animae homo ac Deus, habens in se et totum verumque quod homo est et totum verumque quod Deus est[6]. This incarnation of the Logos is explained in two ways. The Son of God had to put off the *forma Dei:* In forma servi veniens evacuavit se ex Dei forma, nam in forma hominis exsistere manens in Dei forma qui potuit?[7] Theologians have asked themselves what Hilary meant by the *evacuatio ex Dei forma*. The commentary on the sixty-eighth Psalm shows with sufficient clearness that Hilary speaks of the voluntary renunciation by the Logos, during His life on earth, of the public manifestation and splendor that belong by right to Him as God: Aboleri Dei forma, ut tantum servi esset forma, non potuit. Ipse enim est et se ex forma Dei inaniens et formam hominis assumens, quia neque evacuatio illa ex Dei forma naturae caelestis interitus est, neque formae servilis assumptio tanquam genuinae originis conditionisque natura est[8]. To the self-debasement of the Son of God corresponds, however, an elevation of human nature. The manhood of Jesus Christ is of heavenly origin: Primus enim homo de limo terrae; et secundus Adam in huius limi profundum de caelis descendens se ipsum tamquam ex alto veniens defixit[9]. Through His own power the Logos took His own body from the Virgin Mary, and created His own soul out of nothing: Ut per se sibi assumpsit ex virgine corpus, ita ex se sibi animam assumpsit[10] The body of the Lord is a celestial body (cæleste corpus)[11], and therefore endowed with extraordinary excellencies. It is true, according to Hilary, that it shares whatever is essential to our human bodies: there can be no question of the reality of the sufferings and death of Christ. Nevertheless, by its constitution the body of Christ was in every way superior to all human needs (of food and rest) and to all sense of pain and sorrow; it was only by a voluntary act of self-humiliation that the

[1] Ib., vii. 15. [2] In Ps. cxxxviii. 17. [3] In Mt. xvi. 5.
[4] In Ps. li. 16. [5] In Ps. liii. 8. [6] De trin., x. 19.
[7] In Ps. lxviii. 25; cf. Phil. ii. 6—7. [8] In Ps. lxviii. 25.
[9] In Ps. lxviii. 4. [10] De trin., x. 22. [11] Ib., x. 18.

Lord took on Him the conditions of our enfeebled state. According to Hilary, therefore, the transfiguration on Tabor and the walking on the waves of Genesareth are not miracles, as is usually said, but forms of life and self-revelation natural to the body of the Lord. Christ was not only free, at any moment, to exhibit His body transfigured in glory and to withdraw it from all contact with suffering and the law of death, but it always required a special interference of His divine will to divest His body of its natural immunity from all human weakness, and subordinate it to the influences of inimical forces: Naturae enim propriae ac suae corpus illud est, quod in caelestem gloriam conformatur in monte, quod attactu suo fugat febres, quod de sputo suo format oculos[1], and again: Non ambiguum est in natura eius corporis infirmitatem naturae corporeae non fuisse, cui in virtute naturae fuerit omnem corporum depellere infirmitatem[2] There can be no doubt that this teaching puts in a new light the free and meritorious character of the sufferings of Christ; at the same time it is also true that such teaching «makes a very sharp turn around the headland of Docetism».

7. COMPLETE AND PARTIAL EDITIONS. VERSIONS AND RECENSIONS. — The first complete editions of Hilary were published by *D. Erasmus,* Basel, 1523 (1526 1553); *L. Miraeus,* Paris, 1544; *M. Lipsius,* Basel, 1550 (1570). The Benedictine *P. Coustant* († 1721) opened a new epoch in the critical study of the writings of Hilary. His edition (Paris, 1693) merits a place of eminence among all the Maurine editions; an improved edition was made by the Marchese *Scipione Maffei,* Verona, 1730 (Venice, 1749—1750), 2 vols. *Maffei* owed to new manuscripts his emendations of the text of De Trinitate and of the commentary on the Psalms. The *Migne* edition of Hilary (PL., ix—x, Paris, 1844—1845) contains additions to the reprint of *Maffei* but is otherwise very faulty *G. Mercati*, Un foglio dell' Ilario papiraceo di Vienna (Bibliotheca Barberiniana on the text of De Trin., iv. 16 17), in Note di letteratura biblica e cristiana antica (Testi e studi v), Rome, 1901, pp. 99—112. Selected works of St. Hilary have been translated into German by *J. Fisch,* Kempten, 1878 (Bibliothek der Kirchenväter), and into English. A select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church, series II, vol. ix, New York, 1899. — The De Trinitate is reprinted in *H. Hurter,* Ss. Patr. opusc. sel., series II 4, Innsbruck, 1888; cf. *J. Stix,* Zum Sprachgebrauch des hl. Hilarius von Poitiers in seiner Schrift De Trinitate (Progr.), Rottweil, 1891. The De Trinitate is part also of the Bibliotheca Sanctorum Patrum (series V, vol. i—iv), Rome, 1903—1904. In the Vienna codex the De Trinitate is followed by a mutilated text entitled contra Arianos. It was edited by *M. Denis,* Codd. Mss. theologici latini bibliothecae Palatinae Vindobonensis, Vienna, 1799, ii 1, 1102—1111 (not printed in Migne), and attributed by him to Hilary. On a new edition of the same see *H. S. Sedlmayer,* Der Tractatus contra Arianos in der Wiener Hilarius-Handschrift, in Sitzungsberichte der k. Akademie der Wiss. zu Wien, philol.-hist. Klasse (1903), cxlv. *G. Morin,* in Revue Bénédictine (1903), xx. 125—127, attributed it to the Ambrosiaster whom he identifies with Hilarianus Hilarius (§ 90, 10). *U. Manucci* has edited the Adversus haereses (i—iii) in the

[1] De trin., x. 23. [2] Ib., x. 35.

Bibliotheca Sanctorum Patrum (series II, vol. iii), Rome, 1907. — *A. Zingerle* published an excellent edition of the commentary on the Psalms, Vienna, 1891 (Corpus script. eccl. lat. xxii); unfortunately he missed a very ancient text-witness, the Cod. Lugd. 381 saec. vi; consult, however, *Zingerle's* study, Der Hilarius-Codex von Lyon, Vienna, 1893, in Sitzungsberichte der phil.-hist. Klasse der k. Akad. der Wissensch. zu Wien, cxxviii. — Rationem afferendi locos litterarum divinarum, quam in tractatibus super Psalmos sequi videtur S. Hilarius, illustravit *Fr. Schellauf*, Gratz, 1898. The commentary on the minor epistles of St. Paul, published by Pitra in 1852 under the name of St. Hilary, is the work of Theodore of Mopsuestia (§ 73, 4). For the spurious treatises on Matt. i, John i, and Matt. ix, 2 ff. cf. *A. Mai*, Nova Patrum Bibl., part I, Rome, 1852, i. 477—490. *Fr. Liverani*, Spicilegium Liberianum, Florence, 1863, pp. 113—114, published a spurious homily of Hilary. The pretended letter of St. Hilary in *Migne*, PL., x. 733—750, is discussed by *G. Morin*, in Revue Bénédictine (1898), xv. 97—99. — S. Hilarii tractatus de mysteriis et Hymni et S. Sylviae Aquitanae Peregrinatio ad loca sancta. Quae inedita ex codice Arretino deprompsit *J. F. Gamurrini*, Rome, 1887, in Biblioteca dell' Accademia storico-giuridica iv; cf. § 88, 10 for the Peregrinatio S. Sylviae. *F. Cabrol*, Le manuscrit d'Arezzo. Ecrits inédits de Saint-Hilaire et Pèlerinage d'une dame gauloise du IV^e^ siècle aux lieux saints, Paris, 1888 (reprint from the Revue du monde catholique). — *G. M. Dreves*, Das Hymnenbuch des hl. Hilarius, in Zeitschr. f. kath. Theol. (1888), xii. 358—369. The hymns current under the name of Hilary are critically discussed by *B. Hoelscher*, De Ss. Damasi Papae et Hilarii Episc. Pictaviensis qui feruntur hymnis sacris (Progr.), Münster, 1858; *J. Kayser*, Beiträge zur Geschichte und Erklärung der ältesten Kirchenhymnen, 2. ed., Paderborn, 1881, pp. 52—88. On a new edition of the hymn Ad caeli clara non sum dignus sidera cf. *Pitra*, Analecta sacra et classica, Paris, 1888, part 1, pp. 138—141, also Zeitschr. f. kath. Theol. (1889), xiii. 737—740. The verses Hymnum dicat turba fratrum are wrongly attributed to Hilary; cf. *W. Meyer*, Das Turiner Bruchstück der ältesten irischen Liturgie, in Göttinger Nachrichten, philol.-hist. Klasse (1903), pp. 204—208. *A. J. Mason*, The First Latin Christian Poet, in Journal of Theol. Studies (1904), v. 413—432; *Id.*, The Text of the Hymn of Hilary, ib., v 636. *A. S. Walpole*, Hymns attributed to Hilary of Poitiers, in Journal of Theol. Studies (1905), vi. 599—603.

8. WORKS ON SAINT HILARY. — *Ad. Viehhauser*, Hilarius Pictaviensis geschildert in seinem Kampfe gegen den Arianismus, Klagenfurt, 1860. *J. H. Reinkens*, Hilarius von Poitiers, Schaffhausen, 1864. *Dormagen*, St. Hilaire de Poitiers et l'Arianisme (Thèse), Paris, 1864. *V. Hansen*, Vie de St. Hilaire, évêque de Poitiers et docteur de l'église, Luxemburg, 1875. *Largent*, St. Hilaire, Paris, 1802 (Les Saints). *J. B. Wirthmüller*, Die Lehre des hl. Hilarius von Poitiers über die Selbstentäusserung Christi, verteidigt gegen die Entstellungen neuerer protestantischer Theologen, Ratisbon, 1865. *Baltzer*, Die Theologie des hl. Hilarius von Poitiers (Progr.), Rottweil, 1879. *Id.*, Die Christologie des hl. Hilarius von Poitiers (Progr.), ib., 1889. *A. Beck*, Die Trinitätslehre des hl. Hilarius von Poitiers, in Forschungen zur Litt.- und Dogmengeschichte, Mainz, 1903, iii. 2—3. *Id.*, Kirchliche Studien und Quellen, Amberg, 1903, pp. 82—102 Die Lehre des hl. Hilarius von Poitiers über die Leidensfähigkeit des Leibes Christi. *Th. Förster*, Zur Theologie des Hilarius, in Theol. Studien und Kritiken (1888), lxi. 645—686. *J. A. Quillacq*, Quomodo latina lingua usus sit S. Hilarius Pictav. episc. (Thèse), Tours, 1903. *R. de la Broise*, Saint Hilaire, in Dictionnaire de la Bible, Paris, 1903, iii. 707—712.

9. ARIAN LITERATURE. — Under the name of Potamius, Arian bishop of Olisipo (Lisbon), the author of the second formula of Sirmium of the year 357, concisely defined as a blasphemia by Hilary, there are current three brief writings: Tractatus de Lazaro, Tractatus de martyrio Isaiae prophetae, Epistola ad Athanasium (*Gallandi,* Bibl. vet. Patr., v 96—99, *Migne,* PL., viii. 1411—1418). The letter to Athanasius, however, professes the faith of the latter, and must have been written while Potamius still adhered to the Nicene faith; cf. *Schoenemann,* Bibl. hist.-litt. Patr. lat., i. 307—309. *P. B. Gams,* Die Kirchengeschichte von Spanien, Ratisbon, 1864, ii 1, 315—317. — The Arian Candidus left a treatise De generatione divina, and a letter, both addressed to the rhetorician Marius Victorinus (§ 87, 8), and published among the works of the latter (*Migne,* PL., viii. 1013—1020 1035—1040). Clearly Arian in origin and tendency are the fragments of a commentary on Luke (pp. 191—207) and dogmatic treatises (pp. 208—237) found by *Mai,* in codices rescripti, and published by him (Script. vet. nova Coll., Rome, 1828, part 2, iii. 186—237: reprinted in *Migne,* l. c., xiii. 593—628). It is probable that the commentary on Luke was composed about 370 by Ulfilas, the apostle of the Goths († 383), and the dogmatic treatises by his disciple Auxentius, bishop of Dorostorum (Silistria). Cf. *G. L. Krafft,* Commentatio historica de fontibus Ulfilae arianismi ex fragmentis Bobiensibus erutis (Progr.), Bonn, 1860. *G. Mercati,* Antiche reliquie liturgiche (Studii e testi vii), Rome, 1902, pp. 47—71. A fifth-century Paris manuscript, written by a later hand on the margins of some loose leaves, contains a Dissertatio Maximini contra Ambrosium and a correlated text, known as Epistola Auxentii Dorostorensis de fide, vita et obitu Ulfilae. These texts were partially made known by *G. Waitz,* Über das Leben und die Lehre des Ulfila, Hannover, 1840; they are printed entire, as far as legible, by *Fr. Kauffmann,* in his Texte und Untersuchungen zur altgermanischen Religionsgesch., Strassburg, 1899, i. Cf. *L. Saltet,* Un texte nouveau: la Dissertatio Maximini contra Ambrosium, in Bulletin de littérature ecclésiastique (1900), ii. 118—129. *H. Boehmer-Romundt,* Der literarische Nachlass des Wulfila und seiner Schule, in Zeitschrift f. wissensch. Theol. (1903), xlvi. 233—269 361—407; *Id.,* Ein neues Werk des Wulfila? in Neue Jahrb. f. das klass. Altertum (1903), viii. 272 to 288. St. Augustine gives in his reply to an anonymous Quidam sermo Arianorum a brief exposition to the Arian doctrine (cf. § 94, 7). — We have already said (§ 74, 10) that the so-called Opus imperfectum in Matthaeum is of Arian origin, as is likewise the Anonymus in Job (cf. the works of Origen, *Migne,* PG., xvii. 371—522) and § 61, 1 to which section mention of it properly belongs.

### § 87. Other opponents of Arianism.

1. HOSIUS OF CORDOVA. — He was one of the most famous, but also one of the most persecuted, among the Western champions of the Catholic faith during the conflict with Arianism. This great Christian, who was probably president of the Council of Nicæa, was born about 256, and became bishop of Corduba (Cordova in Southern Spain) in 296, and died Aug. 27., 357 He may be justly called the Athanasius of the West (§ 86, 1). He labored for the faith more by word and deeds than by his writings. In his *Historia Arianorum*[1]

[1] *Migne,* PG., xxv. 744—748; cf. PL., viii. 1327—1331.

Athanasius made known a letter in Greek of the brave old martyr of the faith, written in 354 or 355 to the emperor Constantius, frank and bold in its confession of the Catholic faith, but moderate in form. Isidore of Seville says[1] that he wrote an: Epistola ad sororem suam de laude virginitatis, and an: Opus de interpretatione vestium sacerdotalium quae sunt in Veteri Testamento. Pitra published in 1888 49 short sentences under the title: Doctrina Hosii episcopi de observatione disciplinae Dominicae.

The Doctrina is found in *Pitra,* Analecta sacra et classica, Paris, 1888, part 1, p. 117. *P. B. Gams,* Die Kirchengeschichte von Spanien, Ratisbon, 1864, ii 1, 137—309: Hosius von Corduba.

2. LUCIFER OF CALARIS. — Lucifer, bishop of Calaris or Caralis (Cagliari in Sardinia), was sent in 354 by Pope Liberius on an embassy to the military quarters of the emperor Constantius at Arles. At the Synod of Milan (355) he refused to condemn St. Athanasius or, as St. Jerome[2] puts it: sub nomine Athanasii Nicaenam fidem. Consequently he was banished by Constantius to the East, whence he did not return until the reign of Julian (361—363). During his exile (§ 86, 3) and especially after his return, Lucifer became involved in conflicts with his former friends and allies in the episcopate. By the consecration of a new bishop (Paulinus) of Antioch he not only failed to heal the existing schism, but increased its bitterness. The mild and conciliatory measures of the Synod of Alexandria (362) with regard to the penitent Arians were so little to his taste that he seems to have broken off communion with the members of that Synod. It is certain that those who after his death (370 or 371) advocated the exclusion of former Arians from all church offices adopted the name of Luciferians; their schism, however, was of short duration. — During his exile (356—361), Lucifer composed several works, and addressed them to the emperor Constantius. They were probably written in the following order: De non conveniendo cum haereticis[3], in proof of the thesis that the orthodox must avoid all communion with the Arians; De regibus apostaticis[4], against the assertion of Constantius that the felicity of his reign was a proof of divine approval, for many an impious and God-forgetting king of Israel had enjoyed long life and great prosperity; *De Sancto Athanasio* (originally perhaps entitled: Quia absentem nemo debet iudicare nec damnare) liber I—II[5], written to demonstrate the supreme injustice of the imperial order to the bishops at Milan to condemn Athanasius unheard. Apropos of these three works arose very probably the correspondence between Lucifer and Florentius, an officer of the emperor's household[6]. Through the latter the emperor asks Lucifer

[1] De viris ill., c. 5. [2] De viris ill., c. 95.
[3] *Migne,* PL., xiii. 767—794. [4] Ib., xiii. 793—818.
[5] Ib., xiii. 817—936. [6] Ib., xiii. 935—936.

if he be the author of the said invectives, and Lucifer replies with pride in the affirmative. Perhaps there is some connexion between this correspondence and the: De non parcendo in Deum delinquentibus[1], in which Lucifer essays a justification of his language toward the emperor; he quotes principally the examples of the prophets of the Old Testament. Finally, not earlier than 360, and perhaps in 361, he wrote the: Moriendum esse pro Dei filio[2], in which he manifests his great desire for the death of a martyr. Several letters have been lost. A baptismal discourse entitled: Exhortatio S. Ambrosii episc. ad neophytos de symbolo, attributed to Lucifer, and edited (1869) by Caspari, is of doubtful provenance. — The chief characteristic of Lucifer is his very discourteous language toward the emperor. His vocabulary is largely taken from the current language of the people; at the same time any connexion of thought is entirely lacking. There is no better representative of the Latin folk-speech of his day; by reason, moreover, of the very great copiousness of his scriptural quotations, he is an important witness to the pre-Hieronymian Bible-text.

The certainly genuine works of Lucifer have come down by means of a single manuscript (cod. Vat. 133, saec. ix or x). The editio princeps is owing to *J. Tilius,* bishop of Meaux, Paris, 1568 (*Gallandi,* Bibl. vet. Patr. [1770], vi. 153—260). A better edition was brought out by the brothers *J. D.* and *J. Coleti,* Venice, 1778, reprinted in *Migne,* PL., xiii. 1845. The most recent and best edition is that of *W. Hartel,* Vienna, 1886 (Corpus script. eccles. lat. xiv). Cf. *Hartel,* Lucifer von Cagliari und sein Latein, in Archiv für lat. Lexikogr. u. Gramm. (1886), iii. 1—58, also *G. Krüger,* Lucifer, Bischof von Calaris, und das Schisma der Luciferianer, Leipzig, 1886. The baptismal discourse is in *C. P. Caspari,* Ungedruckte Quellen zur Gesch. des Taufsymbols und der Glaubensregel, Christiania, 1869, ii. 132—140, and also in Alte und neue Quellen, Christiania, 1879, pp. 186—195. *Krüger* undertakes (l. c., pp. 118—130) to prove against Caspari in his first work (pp. 175—182) that the real author of the baptismal discourse is Eusebius of Vercellae (see no. 9).

3. FAUSTINUS AND MARCELLINUS. — A priest named Faustinus, of the party of the Luciferians, but otherwise unknown to us, presented to the emperor Theodosius at Constantinople, probably in the autumn of 383, a profession of faith, in order to free himself from the charge of Sabellianism: Fides Theodosio imp. oblata[3]. Together with another priest and sympathizer named Marcellinus, he presented to Valentinian II., Theodosius and Arcadius, a memorial in favor of the persecuted Luciferians: Libellus precum ad imperatores[4]. At the request of the empress Flaccilla he also wrote about 384 an anti-Arian exposition of the Catholic Trinitarian faith: De trinitate sive de fide contra Arianos[5].

[1] *Migne,* PL., xiii. 935—1008. [2] Ib., xiii. 1007—1038.
[3] Ib., xiii. 79—80. [4] Ib., xiii. 83—107.
[5] Ib., xiii. 37—80.

The *Migne* text of these writings is taken from *Gallandi* (Bibl. vet. Patr., vii. 439—474). The Libellus precum, probably called by its authors De confessione verae fidei et ostentatione sacrae communionis et persecutione adversantium veritati is also found in the Collectio Avellana, ed. *O. Guenther* (Vienna, 1895—1898: Corpus script. eccles. lat. xxxv), pp. 5 to 44; cf. *Guenther*, Avellana-Studien (Vienna, 1896), pp. 69—86. For the history of Faustinus and Marcellinus see *G. Krüger*, Lucifer, Bischof von Calaris, pp. 62—63 82—86 94—96.

4. GREGORY OF ELIBERIS. — After Lucifer the principal leader of the Luciferian faction was Gregory, bishop of Eliberis in Baetica (Elvira near Granada), † after 392. St. Jerome says[1] that he composed: diversos mediocri sermone tractatus et de fide elegantem librum. The latter work is probably identical with: De fide orthodoxa contra Arianos[2], a polemic against the decision of the Synod of Rimini (359), by others attributed to Phoebadius, bishop of Agen (see no. 6).

For Gregory of Eliberis see *Gams*, Die Kirchengesch. von Spanien, Ratisbon, 1864, ii 1, 310—314; *Krüger*, Lucifer etc., pp. 76—80. In the Revue d'histoire et de litérature religieuses (1900), v. 145—161. *G. Morin* not only defends Gregory's authorship of the De fide orthodoxa contra Arianos, but also attributes to him the first seven of the twelve books De trinitate (*Migne*, PL., lxii. 237—334) among the works of Vigilius of Tapsus, and the Tractatus Origenis de libris SS. Scripturarum, published in 1900 by *P Batiffol* (§ 55, 4). Against *Morin* cf. *Batiffol*, in Bulletin de littérature ecclésiastique (1900), pp. 190—197, and for *Morin's* reply the Revue Bénédictine (1902), xix. 225—245. In this latter study *Morin* abandons the Gregorian authorship of the De Trinitate, and identifies it with the Libri septem de fide et regulis fidei, current under the name of Syagrius (§ 89, 3). The De fide orthodoxa contra Arianos is also printed among the works of Vigilius of Tapsus (*Migne*, PL., lxii. 466—468 449—463) and among those of St. Ambrose (Ib., PL., xvii. 549—568).

5. HILARY OF ROME. — Hilarius, a Roman deacon († before 379), surpassed Lucifer in his extreme views, he would rebaptize all Arians and wrote on the subject certain: Libellos de haereticis rebaptizandis, known to St. Jerome[3], through whose pages alone we know these details of the writer's life.

For Hilarius of Rome cf. *Krüger*, l. c., pp. 88—89.

6. PHOEBADIUS OF AGEN. — This writer was no less strong in character than Lucifer of Calaris, but more calm and self-possessed. He was bishop of Agennum in Aquitania Secunda (Agen in Guyenne) and died after 392. He wrote a very severe criticism of the second Sirmian formula of the year 357: Liber Contra Arianos[4]. The: De fide orthodoxa contra Arianos[5], goes also under his name; we have seen, however, that it is probably the work of Gregory of Eliberis (see no. 4). Phoebadius also left a Profession of faith[6].

[1] De viris ill., c. 105. [2] *Migne*, PL., xx. 31—50.
[3] *Hier.*, Altercatio Luciferiani et orthodoxi, c. 27.
[4] *Migne*, PL., xx. 13—30. [5] Ib., xx. 31—50. [6] Ib., xx. 49—50.

For the text of these works cf. *Migne* (l. c.) who reprints them from *Gallandi* (Bibl. vet. Patr. [1769], v. 250—265). The contents of the Libe contra Arianos is discussed by *J. Dräseke,* in Zeitschr. f. kirchl. Wissen schaft u. kirchl. Leben (1889), x. 335—343 391—407, also in Zeitschr. wissenschaftl. Theol. (1890), xxxiii. 78—98 (contributions to the criticism of the text). *G. Mercati,* Antiche reliquie liturgiche ambrosiane e roman (in Studi e Testi vii), Rome, 1902, p. 68, n. 1.

7 AN ANONYMOUS. — Highly interesting is the: Altercatio Heracl ani laici cum Germinio episcopo Sirmiensi de fide synodi Nicaena et Ariminensis Arianorum, first edited by Caspari, in 1883. In thi work the layman Heraclianus makes a brilliant defence of the Nicen faith against Germinius, the Arian bishop of Sirmium († ca. 370 The dialogue is not a bit of tendentious theological fiction, but th summary of a real historical colloquy, written about 366 by a lay man, and in a style quite fresh and spontaneous.

The Altercatio is published in *C. P Caspari,* Kirchenhistorische Anec dota, Christiania, 1883, i. 131—147; cf. pp. v—viii.

8. MARIUS VICTORINUS. — Caius Marius Victorinus, born in Africa was one of the most famous of the Roman rhetoricians in the reig of Constantius; his statue was erected in the Forum of Trajan as mark of the popular esteem. He was well-advanced in years whe he became a Christian. In his heathen days he had written man works: grammatical, metrical, rhetorical, and philosophical. St. Jerom tells us[1] that as a Christian he wrote: Adversus Arium libros mor dialectico valde obscuros, qui nisi ab eruditis non intelleguntur, e commentarios in apostolum. There are current under his name thre anti-Arian works: Adversus Arium libri iv.[2], De generatione divi Verbi[3], and De *ὁμοουσίῳ* recipiendo[4]; the first two are addresse to a certain Candidus (§ 86, 9), an Arian friend of the author. Non of these works are in any way important. Some of his commentarie on St. Paul's Epistles have been preserved; those on Galatians Philippians[6], and Ephesians[7], apropos of which *St. Jerome* remark that the learned rhetorician was entirely lacking in theological trai ing: quod occupatus ille eruditione saecularium litterarum scriptura omnino sanctas ignoraverit[8]. Two of his writings are anti-Manichæa in character: Ad Justinum Manichæum, contra duo principia Man chæorum et de vera carne Christi[9] and De verbis scripturae «Factu est vespere et mane, dies unus[10]. The treatise *De physicis*[11], in defenc of the biblical account of creation, is spurious. Three hymns: *D trinitate*[12], and three other Christian poems must also be considere

[1] De viris ill., c. 101. [2] *Migne,* PL., viii. 1039—1138.
[3] Ib., viii. 1019—1036. [4] Ib., viii. 1137—1140.
[5] Ib., viii. 1145—1198. [6] Ib., viii. 1197—1236.
[7] Ib., viii. 1235—1294. [8] Comm. in Gal., praef.
[9] *Migne,* PL., viii. 999—1010. [10] Ib., viii. 1009—1014.
[11] Ib., viii. 1295—1310. [12] Ib., viii. 1139—1146.

spurious; the poems: De pascha seu De ligno vitae seu De cruce (69 hexameters), an enthusiastic description of the Cross as the tree of life; De Jesu Christo Deo et homine (137 hexameters), on the earthly life of our Lord, De martyrio Maccabæorum (394 hexameters), an attempt at a panegyrico-rhetorical dramatization of the scriptural narrative in the seventh chapter of the second book of Maccabees.

According to *H. Usener,* Anecdoton Holderi, Bonn, 1877, pp. 59—66, the work De definitione among the writings of Boethius on logic (*Migne,* PL., lxiv, 891—910) was composed by Marius Victorinus. A critical edition of it is owing to *Th. Stangl,* Tulliana et Mario-Victoriniana (Progr.), Munich, 1888, pp. 12—48. On Marius Victorinus as rhetorician see *Teuffel-Schwabe,* Gesch. der röm. Lit., 5. ed., pp. 1031—1034. — For the hymns and other poems attributed to him cf. *M. Manitius,* Gesch. der christlich-lateinischen Poesie, Stuttgart, 1891, pp. 113—119. The De pascha is found in the *Hartel* edition of the works of Cyprian (part III, pp. 305—308). The De martyrio Maccabaeorum and two other poems, In Genesin ad Leonem papam (a paraphrase in 204 hexameters of the story of the creation) and De Evangelio (114 hexameters on the birth of Christ), were edited recently by *R. Peiper,* Cypriani Galli poetae Heptateuchos, Vienna, 1891 (Corpus script. eccl. lat. xxxiii) 231—274; they are attributed in this work to a certain Hilarius said to have lived in Gaul during the fifth century, but certainly not identical with Hilary of Arles (§ 96, 3).

For the poem In Genesin cf. *St. Gamber,* Le livre de la Genèse dans la poésie latine du V^e^ siècle, Paris, 1899. — Among the writers on Victorinus are *G. Koffmane,* De Mario Victorino philosopho christiano (Dissert. inaug.), Breslau, 1880; *G. Geiger,* C. Marius Victorinus Afer, ein neuplatonischer Philosoph (2 Progr.), Metten, 1888 1889; *R. Schmid,* Marius Viktorinus Rhetor und seine Beziehungen zu Augustin (Inaug.-Diss.), Kiel, 1895. *Muehlenstein,* Philosoph. Vorfragen über die mittelalterlichen Anschauungen vom Schönen und vom Rhythmus, in Gregorianische Rundschau (1902), pp. 72—75.

9. EUSEBIUS OF VERCELLÆ. — Eusebius, in 340 bishop of Vercellæ (Vercelli), was requested by Pope Liberius to accompany Lucifer of Calaris on his embassy to the emperor Constantius. After the synod of Milan (355) he, too, was exiled to the East whence he returned under Julian and thenceforth labored actively to uproot Arianism in his diocese. He died in 371, highly esteemed, and is honored by the Church as a martyr (confessor, Dec. 16.). Only three letters of Eusebius have reached us[1]. His Latin version of the commentary of Eusebius of Cæsarea on the Psalms, often mentioned by St. Jerome[2], has perished (§ 62, 3).

For the baptismal sermon attributed to our Saint by *G. Krüger* see above no. 2. A long profession of faith attributed to him (De s. Trinitate confessio; *Migne.* PL., xii. 959—968) is spurious. The archives of the Cathedral of Vercelli contain a Gospel-codex, said on the authority of old and trustworthy witnesses to have been written by the hand of St. Eusebius;

[1] *Migne,* PL., xii. 947—954; x. 713—714.

[2] De viris ill., c. 96; Ep. 61, 2.

it is one of the most important witnesses to the pre-Hieronymian Latin text (Cod. a); cf. the new edition of *Belsheim:* Codex Vercellensis. Quattuor evangelia ante Hieronymum latine translata ex reliquiis codicis Vercellensis saeculo ut videtur iv. scripti et ex editione Iriciana principe denuo edidit *J. Belsheim,* Christiania, 1894. In the Journal of Theological Studies (1900—1901), i. 592—599, *E. A. Burn* attributes to our Eusebius the Quicumque (§ 66, 3), and the De trinitate of the pseudo-Vigilius of Tapsus. On Eusebius and the authorities for his life see *F. Savio,* Gli antichi vescovi d'Italia (Piemonte), Turin, 1899, pp. 412—420 514—554. For the title of the letter forged by *Meyranesio* cf. *F. Savio,* Le origini della diocesi di Tortona, in Atti della R. Accademia delle scienze di Torino (1903), xxxviii. 10—19.

10. ZENO OF VERONA. — We know but little concerning St. Zeno, and that little needs to be critically sifted and studied. In their works: De viris illustribus both Jerome and Gennadius ignore him. According to the prevailing opinion established by the Ballerini brothers (1739), Zeno was a native of Roman Africa, and eighth bishop of Verona (362—380). He lived in a period of continuous conflict with the last representatives of paganism, fearlessly defended the doctrine of the Church against the Arians, and spent his life in the charitable service of the poor and the sick. The Tractatus or sermons current under his name have provoked much criticism. The latest editors[1] acknowledge 93 as genuine: 16 long and 77 short treatises; the latter, however, are often so brief that they look like mere outlines or summaries of sermons. Nevertheless, in several of these Tractatus are preserved precious evidences of the faith of the Church concerning the Trinity and the Blessed Virgin, others contain details of value for the science of Christian archaeology. His style is strikingly personal and offers no little resemblance to that of Apulejus of Madaura.

For the earlier editions of the Tractatus cf. *Schoenemann,* Bibl. hist.-lit. Patr. lat. i. 314 ff. (*Migne,* PL., xi. 244 ff.). The edition of the brothers Pietro and Girolamo Ballerini was published in 1739 at Verona, and was reprinted in *Gallandi,* Bibl. vet. Patr. v. 105—158, and in *Migne,* l. c. Another edition based on new manuscripts was brought out by Count *J. B. K. Giuliari,* Verona, 1883, 2. ed., ib., 1900. A German version is owing to *P. Leipelt,* Kempten, 1877 (Bibl. der Kirchenväter). — *Fr. A. Schütz,* S. Zenonis episc. Veron. doctrina christiana, Leipzig, 1854. *L. J. V. Jazdzewski,* Zeno Veron. episc. Comment. patrologica, Ratisbon, 1862. *A. Bigelmair,* Zeno von Verona, Münster, 1904, On the numerous reminiscences from writings of the rhetorician Apulejus of Madaura in the sermons of Zeno cf. *C. Weyman,* in Sitzungsberichte der philos.-philol. u. der hist. Klasse der kgl. bayer. Akad. d. Wissensch. (1893), ii. 350—359. — Under the name of the bishop Petronius of Verona there are current two brief Sermones in natali S. Zenonis and in die ordinationis vel natali episcopi; the text may be read in the study of *G. Morin,* in Revue Bénédictine (1897), xiv. 3—8. Gennadius (De viris ill., c. 41) mentions a Petronius, bishop of Bologna, in the first half of the fifth century, to whom

[1] *Migne,* PL., xi. 253—528.

were attributed Vitae patrum monachorum Aegypti and a Tractatus de ordinatione episcopi. Cf. *Czapla,* Gennadius als Literarhistoriker, Münster, 1898, pp. 94 ff.

### § 88. Poets and Historians.

1. JUVENCUS. — Gajus Vettius Aquilinus Juvencus, a Spanish priest of very noble origin, wrote about 330 a kind of Gospel-harmony in hexameter verse; he entitled it: Evangeliorum libri quattuor (formerly known as *Historia evangelica*)[1] In the beginning he follows Luke, but throughout the rest of the work adopts almost exclusively the text of Matthew as his guide, and seems occasionally to compare the original Greek with the Latin version. His diction imitates the biblical language very closely. In spite of the restriction thus imposed on himself, his verse is generally easy and fluent, and shows an excellent grammatical training and no small share of poetical gifts and skill. His work was highly esteemed throughout the entire of the Middle Ages, and was frequently imitated.

The best editions of Juvencus are those of *F. Arevalo,* Rome, 1792 (*Migne,* l. c.); *C. Marold,* Leipzig, 1886, and *J. Huemer,* Vienna, 1891 (Corpus script. eccles. lat. xxiv). — *J. T. Hatfield,* A Study of Juvencus (Dissert. inaug.), Bonn, 1890. *C. Marold,* Über das Evangelienbuch des Juvencus in seinem Verhältnis zum Bibeltext, in Zeitschr. f. wissenschaftl. Theol. (1890), xxxiii. 329—341. *F. Vivona,* De Juvenci poetae amplificationibus, Palermo, 1903. For the Liber in Genesim (following in *Migne,* PL., xix. 345—380 the Historia evang.) see below no. 2. The hymn (Ib., xix. 379—386; cf. lxi. 1091—1094) De laudibus Domini glorifies our Lord as Creator of the world and Redeemer of mankind. Its 148 hexameters were probably composed before the time of Juvencus, by a rhetorician of Augustodonum (Autun). A new edition of it, with learned apparatus, is to *W. Brandes,* Über das frühchristliche Gedicht «Laudes Domini» (Progr.), Brunswick, 1887. — For other works on Juvencus cf. *M. Manitius,* Gesch. der christlich-lateinischen Poesie, Stuttgart, 1891, pp. 42—44.

2. CYPRIANUS GALLUS. — Formerly Juvencus was credited by many with a metrical recension of the historical books of the Old Testament; it is now recognized that this work belongs to a much more recent date. The author lived in Gaul at the beginning of the fifth century, and the manuscript tradition is sufficient proof that he was called Cyprian and that the name is not fictitious but historical. The original work seems to have included all historical books of the Old Testament; so far only the paraphrases of the Pentateuch, Josue and Judges, are known to us, with a few insignificant fragment of the other books; the text of the portions preserved is not free from gaps and breaks. As a rule Cyprian follows faithfully his scriptural model; only occasionally does he abbreviate or enlarge. His narrative is somewhat cold and dry; we often miss even the

[1] Ib., xix. 53—346.

original vivacity of the biblical text. He also violates very often the rules of Latin metre.

It was only in 1560 that some verses (165 hexameters on the beginning of Genesis) of this extensive work were made known (also in *Oehler's* Tertullian II. 774—776, and in *Hartel's* Cyprian III. 283—288). In 1733 *E. Martène* published the entire text of the paraphrase on Genesis (with the exception of verses 325—378). It was reprinted in *Arevalo's* edition of the Historia evangelica (*Migne,* PL., xix. 345—380; see no. 1). The rest of Cyprian's remains were published by *J. B. Pitra,* Spicilegium Solesmense, Paris, 1852, i. 171—258; Analecta sacra et classica, Paris, part 1, pp. 181—207.

An excellent complete edition is due to *R. Peiper,* Cypriani Galli poetae Heptateuchos, Vienna, 1891 (Corpus script. eccles. lat. xxiii); cf. *H. Ph. Best,* De Cypriani quae feruntur metris in Heptateuchum (Diss. inaug.), Marburg, 1891. Best distributes the authorship of the work between two writers: Cyprian who wrote the Genesis-paraphrase in Italy about 410, and an anonymous writer who composed the paraphrase of Exodus-Judges in Gaul early in the fifth century. *A. Stutzenberger,* Der Heptateuch des gallischen Dichters Cyprianus, Zweibrücken, 1903 (against the theory of Best). — Cf. *St. Gamber,* Le livre de la Genèse dans la poésie latine du V^e^ siècle, Paris, 1899. For other works attributed to our Cyprian cf. § 51, 6.

3. ANONYMOUS. — The two poems *De Sodoma* and *De Jona,* very probably the work of a contemporary and fellow-citizen of Cyprian, show that their author possessed the poetical faculty in a greater degree. The first relates in 167 hexameters the downfall of Sodom; the second, only partially (the beginning is in 105 hexameters) preserved, describes the salvation of Ninive. Its proper title, therefore, should have been *De Ninive;* doubtless the actual title indicates only the biblical source of the poet's inspiration. In this work the scriptural narrative is reproduced in an original and attractive manner; the diction is polished, and the verse correct and graceful.

In the manuscripts and in the printed editions these two poems are usually found among the (spurious) works of Tertullian (*Oehler,* ii. 769 to 773) and Cyprian (*Hartel,* iii. 289—301). The best and latest edition of them is that of *Peiper,* Cypriani Galli poetae Heptateuchos, pp. 212—226. On De Sodoma cf. *Gamber,* l. c.

4. PROBA. — Vergil furnished the poetical model for the works hitherto described, his own words were now used by the lady Proba to construct a Cento Virgilianus or «variegated pattern» of 694 hexameters[1], taken entirely or in part from the Aeneid and other works of the poet, and so arranged as to reproduce (partially) the scriptural narrative. From the Old Testament she selects for long description only the Creation, the Fall of Adam and Eve, and the Deluge. Thereon directly follows the Gospel-history from the Birth of Christ to the Ascension. It is unnecessary to insist farther on the oddity

[1] *Migne,* PL., xix. 803—818.

of biblical ideas in the mouth of Vergil. This Proba was formerly supposed to be Anicia Faltonia Proba, but now we know that she was the grand-daughter of this lady and the wife of Clodius Celsinus Adelphius, city-prefect (praefectus urbi) of Rome in 351. Before her conversion to Christianity she had written a (lost) epic poem on the war between Constantius and the usurper Magnentius.

Probae Cento. Rec. *K. Schenkl:* Poetae christiani minores, part 1, Vienna, 1888 (Corpus script. eccles. lat. xxi), 511 ff. *J. Aschbach,* Die Anicier und die römische Dichterin Proba, Vienna, 1870 (Sitzungsberichte der phil.-hist. Klasse der kgl. Akad. der Wissensch. lxiv). In the edition of *Schenkl* will be found three other Centones Virgiliani composed by Christians Versus ad gratiam Domini (pp. 609—615), an instruction on the Christian religion in the shape of a dialogue between the shepherd Tityrus and Meliboeus, the work of a certain *Pomponius;* De Verbi incarnatione (pp. 615—620), wrongly attributed in the past to Sedulius (§ 91, 5); De ecclesia (pp. 621—627). All three are later than the work of Proba. For other details concerning this kind of literary work cf. *Teuffel-Schwabe,* Gesch. der röm. Lit., 5. ed., pp. 41 1216—1217 1228; *Manitius,* Gesch. der christl.-latein. Poesie, pp. 127—130.

5. AUSONIUS. — The accomplished and erudite rhetorician Decimus Magnus Ausonius, of Burdigala (Bordeaux), born about 310 and deceased about 395, has his place rather in the general history of Roman literature. Nominally he was a Christian. In his writings however (Ephemeris, Domestica, Parentalia, Commemoratio professorum Burdigalensium, Epitaphia heroum qui bello Troico interfuerunt, Eclogarum liber etc.), generally it is heathen thought and style that predominate. In some of his poems, however, versified Christian prayers are found: Ephemeris iii. oratio (ed. *Peiper,* pp. 7 to 11); Domest. ii. versus paschales (pp. 17—19); ib. iii. oratio versibus rhopalicis, i. e. verses in which each word is a syllable longer than the preceding word (pp. 19—21).

Most of the writings of Ausonius are found in *Migne,* PL., xix. 817 ff. The most recent complete editions are those of *K. Schenkl,* Berlin, 1883 (Mon. Germ. hist. Auct. antiquiss., v. 2), and *R. Peiper,* Leipzig, 1886. Cf. *Teuffel-Schwabe,* l. c., pp. 1062—1070, and on his Christian poetry *Manitius,* l. c., pp. 105—111.

6. DAMASUS. — St. Damasus (366—384) was one of the most celebrated of the fourth-century popes and cultivated the epigram with especial success. We owe to him many metrical epitaphs (tituli), also metrical inscriptions for churches and chapels, all of which were executed in a calligraphy of special artistic perfection by his friend and admirer Furius Dionysius Philocalus (Damasene letters). Some specimens of the work of Philocalus are still preserved on the original marble, but the greater part of these poems is known to us in transcriptions only. They abound in errors of prosody, but also in dogmatic allusions of very great value. Damasus wrote other short non-

inscriptional poems on martyrs and holy persons; the largest of them (carmen 7)[1] relates the conversion and martyrdom of St. Paul in 26 hexameters. Two hymns: one (carmen 8) to the apostle St. Andrew, and the other (carmen 30) to St. Agatha, are now known to be spurious. St. Jerome remarks[2] that Damasus wrote on virginity both in verse and in prose (versu prosaque). An ancient catalogue of manuscripts mentions: Damasi papae liber de vitiis[3]. Apart from his epigrams and poems only some letters of Damasus have reached us[4]

The folio edition of *A. M. Merenda* (Rome, 1754) is reprinted in *Migne,* PL., xiii. 109 ff.; ib., lxxiv. 527—530, a Carmen Damaso papae adscriptum is found. An excellent edition of the epigrams and poems, considerably increased especially by the discoveries of *G. B. de Rossi* († 1894) is due to Ihm: Damasi Epigrammata. Accedunt Pseudodamasiana aliaque ad Damasiana inlustranda idonea. Rec. et adnot. *M. Ihm,* Leipzig, 1895 (Anthologiae latinae supplementum i). Cf. *Id.,* in Rhein. Museum f. Philol., new series (1895), l. 191—204; *C. Weyman,* in Revue d'hist. et de littér. relig. (1896), i. 58—73, also *M. Amend,* Studien zu den Gedichten des Papstes Damasus (Progr.), Würzburg, 1894. *J. Wilpert* discovered another epigram of Damasus in four hexameters, dedicated to his mother; cf. *Lorenza,* Nuovo Bullett. di Archeol. crist. (1903), ix. 50—58. — *B. Hoelscher,* De SS. Damasi papae et Hilarii episc. Pictaviensis qui feruntur hymnis sacris (Progr.), Münster, 1858. *J. Kayser,* Beiträge zur Geschichte und Erklärung der ältesten Kirchenhymnen, 2. ed., Paderborn, 1881, pp. 89—126. — For the letters of Damasus (genuine and spurious) cf. *Jaffé,* Regesta Pontificum Romanorum, 2. ed., Leipzig, 1885, i. 37—40, n. 232 to 254. — There is a German version of the letters in *Wenzlowsky,* Die Briefe der Päpste (Bibl. der Kirchenväter), ii. 265—406. *G. Ficker,* Bemerkungen zu einer Inschrift des Papstes Damasus, in Zeitschr. f. Kirchengeschichte (1901—1902), xxii. 333—342; *G. Mercati,* Il carme damasino «De Davide» e la falsa corrispondenza di Damaso e Girolamo riguardo al Salterio, in Note di letteratura biblica e cristiana antica (Studi e Testi v), Rome, 1901, pp. 113—126; *J. Wittig,* Papst Damasus I. Quellenkritische Studien zu seiner Geschichte und Charakteristik, Rome, 1902, in Römische Quartalschr., fasc. supplem. 14). In the Journal of Theol. Studies (1900 to 1901), i. 556 ff., *C. H. Turner* brought out a new edition of the decrees of the Roman Synod of 382, republished with additional decrees by Gelasius I. (§ 114, 1). *E. Ch. Babut,* La plus ancienne décrétale, Paris, 1904.

7 TWO POLEMICAL POEMS. — The famous Paris manuscript of Prudentius (Cod. Puteaneus saec. vi.) has handed down a *Carmen adv. paganos* which satirizes with caustic wit the old heathen belief. Its 122 hexameters were probably composed about 394, apropos of the hopeless overthrow of polytheism which for a while had begun to lift its head again under the usurper Eugenius (392—394) and the city prefect of Rome, Nicomachus Flavianus. This historical background lends interest to an otherwise insignificant work. To the same time and circle belongs the poem: Ad quendam senatorem ex Christiana religione ad idolorum servitutem conversum (85 hexameters),

[1] *Migne,* PL, xiii. 379—381. [2] Ep. 22, 22.
[3] *L. Delisle,* Les manuscrits du Comte d'Ashburnham, Paris, 1883, p. 87.
[4] *Migne,* PL., xiii. 347—376.

in which a Christian senator, now become a worshipper of Cybele and Isis, is made the butt of some not insipid satire.

The Carmen adversus paganos was first edited entire by *L. Delisle*, in the Bibliothèque de l'Ecole des Chartes, series 6 (1867), iii. 297—303. *Th. Mommsen* edited it anew in Hermes (1870), iv. 350—363. *G. Dobbelstein*, De carmine christiano codicis Parisini 8084 contra fautores paganae superstitionis ultimos (Diss. inaug.), Louvain, 1879. Other editions are noted in *Teuffel-Schwabe*, l. c., p. 1121, and *Manitius*, l. c., p. 146. *Seefelder*, Abhandlung über das Carmen adv. Flavianum (Progr.), Gmünd, 1901. — The second poem was last edited by *Peiper*, Cypriani Galli poetae Heptateuchos, pp. 227—230, and is found also in *Hartel's* Cyprian, iii. 302—305.

8. THE CHRONOGRAPHER OF THE YEAR 354. — Under this name historians are wont to speak of the unknown author or compiler of a guide or manual for the City of Rome, written in 354 and containing a copious variety of historical material. Most of its quite miscellaneous contents may rightly claim an official character, and are, therefore, historical authorities of the first order. It contains: a) an official Roman municipal calendar of the middle of the fourth century, transcribed in 354 by Philocalus (see no. 6), and adorned with numerous figures and epigrams; b) the consular lists from the beginning of the consulate to the year 354; c) an Easter table for the years 312—411 (410); d) a catalogue of the City Prefects from 254 to 354, e) a catalogue of the annual commemorations of popes (depositiones episcoporum romanorum) from Dionysius († 268) to Julius I. (352); f) a calendar of the feasts of the Roman Church with special mentions of the anniversaries of martyrs (depositiones martyrum); g) a catalogue of the popes from Peter to Liberius (elected pope in 352), it forms the basis of the oldest part of the so-called Liber pontificalis (§ 118, 7); h) a description of the quarters or wards of the City of Rome (regiones urbis Romae), composed about 334, i) a general Chronicle reaching to 334, being a recension and a continuation of the Chronicle of Hippolytus (§ 54, 6); k) a chronicle of the City of Rome as far as 324. It is to be noted that the manuscripts through which this work has reached us have received various additions at later periods.

Some parts of this large compilation were published as early as the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The work was edited entire, with exception of the city-calendar a) and the description of the regiones h) by *Th. Mommsen*, in Abhandlungen der philolog.-histor. Klasse der kgl. sächs. Gesellsch. der Wissensch., Leipzig, 1850, i. 547—693. The same savant re-edited the work, with exception of the city-description h), in Monumenta Germ. hist. Auct. antiqu., Berlin, 1892, ix 1, 13—196. For the editions of the calendar and the description of the city-wards cf. *Teuffel-Schwabe*, l. c., pp. 119 1041 f.

9. HEGESIPPUS. — This name was long borne by the Latin translator or editor of the (Greek) «History of the Jewish War» of Josephus Flavius. The Latin name was the result of a misunderstanding: out

of *Ἰώσηπος* was made Iosippus, which gave way to Egesippus and finally to Hegesippus, so that Hegesippus was only the disfigured name of the author. Critical considerations, both internal and external, compel us to assign the translation to the latter half of the fourth century. Whether it be a youthful work of St. Ambrose or the production of another is still perhaps an open question, although at present most critics, in view of the testimony of the manuscripts and the resemblance its style bears to that of his known works, agree in attributing it to the great bishop of Milan. The translator, whoever he may be, abbreviated in some places the original work; thus, the last three books (v—vii) have been condensed into one book (v). Elsewhere he enlarged his text, either by means of supplements drawn from other quarters or by rhetorical additions; moreover, he imparted a Christian character to the entire work.

The original Benedictine edition of St. Ambrose (Paris, 1686—1690) did not contain the so-called Hegesippus; cf. t. ii, praef. iv—v. *Gallandi* printed it in Bibl. vet. Patr. vii. 653—771, whence it passed into the Venice reprint of the Benedictine Ambrose (1781—1782) ii, Appendix (with special pagination), and into *Migne,* PL., xv. 1961—2224. A separate edition was brought out by *C. Fr. Weber* and *J. Caesar,* Marburg, 1864. On this edition is based the Hegesippus-text found in the *Ballerini* edition of St. Ambrose, Milan, 1875—1883, vi. 1—276. *Fr. Vogel,* De Hegesippo qui dicitur, Iosephi interprete (Diss. inaug.), Erlangen, 1880. *Vogel,* Ambrosius und der Übersetzer des Josephus, in Zeitschr. für die österreich. Gymnasien (1883), xxxiv. 241—249 (Vogel does not admit that Ambrose is the translator). *H. Rönsch,* Die lexikalischen Eigentümlichkeiten der Latinität des sogen. Hegesippus, in Romanische Forschungen (1883), i. 256—321, reprinted in Rönsch, Collectanea philologa, herausgegeben von *C. Wagener,* Bremen, 1891, pp. 32—89 (Ambrose is the translator). *E. Klebs,* Das lateinische Geschichtswerk über den jüdischen Krieg, in Festschrift zum 50jährigen Doktorjubiläum L. Friedländer dargebracht, Leipzig, 1895, pp. 210—241 (Ambrose is not the translator). After a profound comparative study of the grammatical and stylistic peculiarities of the pseudo-Hegesippus and the works of Ambrose, the latter is declared by *G. Langraf,* Die Hegesippus-Frage, in Archiv. f. latein. Lexikogr. (1902), xii. 465—472, to be the translator of the work in question.

10. PILGRIM-NARRATIVES. — There is extant a work under the title of: Itinerarium a Burdigala Hierusalem usque, that is not precisely the description of a journey, but a very concise narrative of a pilgrimage from Bordeaux to Jerusalem, and thence to Milan by way of Rome. The earliest account of a pilgrimage to the Holy Land is the: Peregrinatio ad loca sancta, written by a woman, and first discovered by Gamurrini. The text, unfortunately quite imperfect, seems to indicate that the author was a nun in southern Gaul. Gamurrini came to the conclusion that she was St. Sylvia of Aquitaine, a sister of Rufinus, prime minister of the Eastern Empire under Theodosius the Great and Arcadius. The travels of the pious and erudite pilgrim took place probably in the years 380—390 (385—388?).

It was at Constantinople that she prepared for her cloistered sisters in Gaul this simple and plain narrative of all she had seen and experienced. The work possesses a manifold interest; to the theologian it is especially important for the description of the liturgical services at Jerusalem, particularly during Holy Week and at Easter.

The Itinerarium Burdigalense opens the series of Itinera Hierosolymitana et descriptiones Terrae Sanctae, edited by *T Tobler* and *A. Molinier,* Geneva, 1879, i. 1—25; it is also first among the Itinera Hierosolymitana saeculi iv—viii edited by *P. Geyer,* Vienna, 1898 (Corpus script. eccles. lat. xxxix), pp. 1—33. — S. Hilarii Tractatus de mysteriis et Hymni et S. Silviae Aquitanae Peregrinatio ad loca sancta. Quae inedita ex codice Arretino deprompsit *J. F. Gamurrini,* Rome, 1887. Gamurrini brought out in 1888 a second and improved edition of the Peregrinatio. The most recent and best edition is that of *Geyer* (l. c., pp. 35—101). — *C. Weyman,* Über die Pilgerfahrt der Sylvia in das heilige Land, in Theol. Quartalschr. (1888), lxx. 34—50. *L. de Saint-Aignan,* Le pèlerinage de Sainte Sylvie aux lieux saints en 385, Orleans, 1889. *F Cabrol,* Les églises de Jérusalem, la discipline et la liturgie au IV^e^ siècle. Etude sur la Peregrinatio Silviae, Paris-Poitiers, 1895. *E. A. Bechtel,* Sanctae Silviae peregrinatio, the text and a study of the Latinity, London, 1902. *M. Férotin,* Le véritable auteur de la Peregrinatio Sylviae, in Revue des questions historiques (1903), lxxiv. 381—397; the pilgrim in question is Etheria, a Spanish nun mentioned by the monk Valerius, in *Migne,* PL., lxxxvii. 421.

### § 89. Schisms and heresies; their defenders and opponents.

1. NOVATIANISM. — The followers of Novatian (§ 55) survived for some centuries, East and West, as a rigorist and schismatic faction. In Spain they were refuted by St. Pacian, bishop of Barcelona (about 360—390). St. Jerome says of him[1] that he was: castigatae eloquentiae et tam vita quam sermone clarus. Of his three letters to the Novatian Sympronianus the first two[2] treated particularly of the term «Catholic», as the special characteristic of the Church[3]. The third and somewhat longer letter is devoted to the Catholic teaching concerning penance. Pacian also wrote a short *Paraenesis ad pœnitentiam*[4] and a *Sermo de baptismo*[5]. A little work entitled «The Fawn» (Cervulus) in opposition to certain heathen excesses practised in Spain at the New Year has perished (see Paraenesis, c. 1).

The first to edit the writings of Pacian was *Tilius,* Paris, 1538. This edition is correctly reprinted in *Gallandi* (Bibl. vet. Patr. vii, 255—276), and in *Migne,* l. c. A new but unsatisfactory edition was published by *Ph. H. Peyrot,* Zwolle, 1896; cf. *C. Weyman,* in Berliner philol. Wochenschrift 1896, pp. 1057—1062 1104—1108. *P. B. Gams,* Die Kirchengesch. von Spanien ii. 1, Ratisbon, 1864, 318—324. *A. Gruber,* Studien zu Pacianus von Barcelona, Munich 1901. *R. Kauer,* Studien zu Pacianus, Vienna, 1902. — It was to Dexter, a son of Pacian, that St. Jerome dedicated his De viris illustribus (cf. § 2, 1). Jerome says of Dexter (De viris ill., c. 132): Fertur ad me omnimodam historiam texuisse, quam necdum

[1] De viris ill., c. 106. [2] *Migne,* PL., xiii. 1051—1082.
[3] Ep. i. 4: Christianus mihi nomen est, Catholicus vero cognomen.
[4] *Migne,* PL., xiii. 1081—1090. [5] Ib., xiii. 1089—1094.

legi. The historical work here mentioned was never published. The Chronicon Dextri (*Migne,* PL., xxxi. 55—572) covering the period from the birth of Christ to 430, that the Spanish Jesuit Hieronimo Roman de la Higuera († 1611) pretended to have discovered, is a forgery. Cf. *Gams,* l. c., pp. 334—336, and *Bähr,* Die christl. Dichter und Geschichtschreiber Roms, 2. ed., Karlsruhe, 1872, pp. 223—225. — St. Jerome mentions (l. c., c. 111) the autobiography (tam prosa quam versibus) of the Spaniard Aquilius Severus, who died during the reign of Valentinian I. (364—375). It was entitled καταστροφή or πεῖρα and has perished.

2. DONATISM. — In the Donatist controversy the African Church encountered a problem in every sense vital and one in which the Novatians made common cause with the African heretics, it being laid down as a thesis that no unholy person could be a member of the Church of Christ. The Donatists in particular maintained that the efficacy of the sacraments depended on the subjective dispositions of the minister. They held this doctrine not only as regards orthodoxy in which they were one with the opponents of heretical baptism (§ 51, 1), but also as regards personal morality. They abandoned thereby the concept of the Church as an external and visible society and ascribed the fact of justification by sacraments to the condition of the minister. The author of this false teaching was Donatus, bishop of Casae Nigrae in Numidia about the year 313. No works are current under his name. The first literary champion of the sect was Donatus the Great, schismatic bishop of Carthage († ca. 355). According to St. Jerome[1] he wrote many works (multa ad suam haeresim pertinentia opuscula et de Spiritu Sancto liber Ariano dogmati congruens). They have all perished, together with those of his successor Parmenianus; the latter, however, inspired the anti-Donatist writings of St. Optatus and St. Augustine. — Optatus, bishop of Mileve in Numidia, about 370, wrote a large work in six books usually known as *Contra Parmenianum Donatistam*[2]. About 385 he returned to the task, corrected and completed his work (hence the mention: of pope Siricius ii. 3), and added a seventh book[3]. The first book outlines the history of the Donatist schism (Schisma confusae mulieris iracundia peperit, ambitus nutrivit, avaritia roboravit: i. 19). The second demonstrates that there is but one Church, and indicates where it may be found and recognized (Negare non potes scire te in urbe Roma Petro primo Cathedram episcopalem esse collatam, in qua sederit omnium apostolorum caput Petrus, unde et Cephas est appellatus, in qua una cathedra unitas ab omnibus servaretur: ii. 2). In the third book he explains in detail why the Catholics are not to be blamed for the severe measures of the imperial government against the Donatists. The fourth book is a refutation of the false exegesis of Parmenian who twisted against the holy mass and the sacraments of the Catholics the words of

[1] De viris ill., c. 93. [2] *Migne,* PL., xi. 883—1082. [3] Ib., xi. 1081—1104.

Isaias lxvi. 3: Sacrificium peccatoris quasi qui victimet canem (iv 6), and Psalm cxl. 5: Oleum peccatoris non ungat caput meum (iv. 7). The fifth book is devoted to baptism and develops the so-called opus operatum theory (Sacramenta per se esse sancta, non per homines. Deus lavat, non homo: v. 4). In the sixth book he depicts the odious and sacrilegious conduct of the Donatists who broke all altars and chalices used by Catholics: Quid est enim altare nisi sedes et corporis et sanguinis Christi? (vi. 1); fregisti etiam calices, Christi sanguinis portatores (vi. 2). Finally, in the seventh book, he made some additions and corrections. The entire work is animated by an intense desire for re-union with his separated brethren. The language of Optatus is bold and impressive, but also somewhat coarse and rude.

We owe the first (folio) edition of Optatus to *J. Cochlaeus,* Mainz, 1549. Specially famous is the excellent folio edition of *L. E. Dupin,* Paris, 1700, reprinted in *Gallandi,* Bibl. vet. Patr. v. 459 ff., in *Migne,* l. c., and *Hurter,* Ss. Patr. opusc. sel., Innsbruck, 1870, x. The latest and best edition is that of *C. Ziwsa,* Vienna, 1893 (Corpus script. eccles. lat. xxvi). Cf. *Id.,* Beiträge zu Optatus Milevitanus, in Eranos Vindobonensis, Vienna, 1893, pp. 168—176 (treats of the palaeographical tradition, text-criticism and style of Optatus). — Optatus often mentions (i. 14 20 26 27) a collection of acta that he had appended to his work in justification of his exposé of the history of the Donatist schism. This collection of documents has reached us in only one manuscript (Cod. Parisinus saec. xi) and even that is imperfect (ed. *Ziwsa,* pp. 183—216). Lately much critical labor has been extended on this collection, with varying results: *D. Völter,* Der Ursprung des Donatismus, Freiburg im Br. and Tübingen, 1883; *O. Seeck,* Quellen und Urkunden über die Anfänge des Donatismus, in Zeitschr. f. Kirchengesch. (1888—1889), x. 505—568; *L. Duchesne,* Le dossier du donatisme, in Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire (1890), x. 589—650. In this study Duchesne defended triumphantly against Völter and Seeck the genuineness of the documents used by Optatus and the credibility of the statements made by him. — Cf. *W. Thümmel,* Zur Beurteilung des Donatismus, Halle, 1893. The pseudo-Cyprianic treatise De singularitate clericorum (ed. *Hartel,* app., pp. 173—210) is now attributed, after *G. Morin,* to Macrobius, Donatist bishop in Rome, (ca. 363—375). This is the opinion of *Harnack,* Der pseudocyprianische Traktat De singularitate clericorum, in Texte und Untersuchungen, new series, (1903), ix. 3. The latter sees also in Macrobius the author of the Passio Maximiani et Isaiae donatistarum (*Migne,* PL., viii. 767—774). *F. Martroye,* Une tentative de révolution sociale en Afrique. Donatistes et Circoncellions, in Revue des questions historiques, 1904, i. 354—416. For the Donatist Tychonius cf. § 93, 13.

3. PRISCILLIANISM. — There exists as yet no sufficiently clear account of the origin and nature of the Priscillianist heresy that afflicted so severely the Church of Spain. The writings of the heresiarch Priscillian, first edited by Schepss (1889) contradict in various ways the received accounts of the heresy, particularly those of Sulpicius Severus[1] At the same time, by reason of their imperfect manuscript-tradition and the obscurity of their diction, these newly found writings contain what are at present insurmountable dif-

[1] Chron. ii. 46—51; Dial. ii. (iii.) 11 ff.

ficulties. It is certain, however, that Priscillian put forth Gnostic-dualistic speculations vividly reminiscent of Manichæism, and propped up, apparently, a system or framework of mythological and astrological ideas. Their adversaries maintained that the Priscillianists joined a gross immorality with a public show of asceticism. Priscillian himself belonged to a noble Spanish family, and entered upon life highly endowed with gifts both of mind and fortune. In 380 a synod of Cæsaraugusta (Saragossa) excommunicated both himself and his disciples. It was then, according to Sulpicius Severus[1], that his friends made him bishop of Abila in Lusitania. Violent conflicts followed, in which the Catholics had for leaders Hydatius (Idacius) of Emerita and Ithacius of Ossonoba, bishops of whom Sulpicius Severus speaks in no flattering terms. In the end Priscillian and several of his adherents were decapitated at Trier in 385 by order of the usurper Maximus, and in spite of the strong protest of St. Martin of Tours. The crime for which they were juridically tried and executed was magic. We knew from St. Jerome[2] that Priscillian had written many small works (opuscula). Schepss discovered eleven of these writings in a fifth- or sixth- century manuscript belonging to the University of Würzburg. The author is not formally named in this codex; nevertheless, most of the treatises show by their contents that they come from the hand of the leader of the Priscillianists. The first three are devoted to his own defence. The: Liber Apologeticus (ed. Schepss pp. 3—33) is addressed to the *beatissimi sacerdotes* whom Schepss identifies as the 380 bishops of the synod of Saragossa. In it the writer defends himself from the charges of sacrilegious acts and heretical teachings (incidentally, he quotes [p. 6] the Comma Johanneum). The: Liber ad Damasum episcopum (pp. 34—43) contains an appeal to that pope expressly based on historical grounds. The: Liber de fide et de apocryphis (pp. 44—56) maintains that it is lawful to read orthodox apocryphal writings. Then follow seven discourses in which Priscillian nowhere appears as an accused person but speaks as a teacher to a circle of confiding disciples: Tractatus paschae (pp. 57—61), Tractatus Genesis (pp. 62—68), Tractatus Exodi (pp. 69—81), Tractatus primi Psalmi (pp. 82—85), Tractatus Psalmi tertii (pp. 86—89), Tractatus ad populum I (pp. 90—91), Tractatus ad populum II (pp. 92—102). These writings close with a prayer entitled: Benedictio super fideles (pp. 103—106) in which the author praises the omnipotence and goodness of God. Four of the eleven treatises are mutilated, 3 and 9 at the beginning, 8 and 11 at the end. The Schepss edition is followed by an appendix: Priscilliani in Pauli apostoli epistulas Canones a Peregrino episcopo emendati (pp. 107—147), and: Orosii ad Augustinum Commonitorium de errore Priscillianistarum et Origenistarum (pp. 149—157). The

[1] Chron. ii. 47. [2] De viris ill., c. 121.

first of these works, published by Mai in 1843, but in an incomplete state, is an outline of the Pauline theology in 90 sentences (canones), each of which, however, is followed by the relevant texts or passages from the Epistles of St. Paul. The original of this work has perished; what we have now is an orthodox recension (sanae doctrinae redditum est: Prooem.) made before 821 by an otherwise unknown bishop Peregrinus. In the afore-mentioned memorial of Orosius to Augustine (§ 95, 2) he quoted (ed. Schepss, p. 153) a passage from a letter of Priscillian.

Priscilliani quae supersunt, maximam partem nuper detexit adiectisque commentariis criticis et indicibus primus edidit G. Schepss. Accedit Orosii Commonitorium de errore Priscillianistarum et Origenistarum. Vienna, 1889 (Corpus script. eccles. lat. xviii). — Cf. *A. Puech,* in Journal des savants (Febr., May, June, 1891); *H. Leclerc* (follows Puech), in his L'Espagne chrétienne, c. iii, Paris, 1906. *Fr. Paret,* Priscillianus, ein Reformator des 4. Jahrhunderts, Würzburg, 1891. *A. Hilgenfeld,* Priscillianus und seine neuentdeckten Schriften, in Zeitschr. f. wissenschaftl. Theol. (1892), xxxv. 1—85. *Schepss,* Pro Priscilliano, in Wiener Studien (1893), xv. 128—147 (against those who doubt the genuineness of the treatises). *S. Merkle,* Der Streit über Priscillian, in Theol. Quartalschr. (1896), lxxviii. 630—649. *J. Dierich,* Die Quellen zur Geschichte Priscillians (Inaug.-Diss.), Breslau, 1897. *Künstle,* Das Comma Johanneum, auf seine Herkunft untersucht, Freiburg, 1905. The same author has written «Antipriscilliana» (Freiburg, 1905), the best work on Priscillian's errors and their condemnation. *A. Lavertujon,* Sulpice Sévère édité etc., (1899), ii. 548 ff. *G. Mercati,* I due trattati al popolo di Priscilliano, in Note di letteratura biblica e cristiana antica (Studi e testi, v. 5), Rome, 1901, pp. 127—136. *E. Edling,* Priscillianus och den äldre priscillianismen, Upsala, 1902, i. — Several other works written during the original controversies have perished. Priscillian himself speaks at the beginning of his Liber Apologeticus (p. 3) about a Libellus fratrum nostrorum Tiberiani, Asarbi et ceterorum, cum quibus nobis una fides et unus est sensus. St. Jerome says (De viris ill., c. 123), that this Tiberianus tried to justify himself in a turgid and pretentious apology (apologeticum tumenti compositoque sermone). He was afterwards exiled as a follower of Priscillian. Cf. *G. Morin,* in Revue Bénédictine (1898), xv. 97—99. St. Jerome says (l. c., c. 122) that the Latronianus executed with Priscillian was a very learned man and a distinguished poet, (valde eruditus et in metrico opere veteribus comparandus . extant eius ingenii opera diversis metris edita). — The Priscillianist writer Dictinius, bishop of Astorga, before his conversion in 400, composed at an earlier date a work entitled Libra in defence of a white lie (mendacium necessarium); it is possible to reconstruct it from the refutation published by St. Augustine in his Contra mendacium (§ 94, 9); cf. *Fr. Lezius,* in Abhandlungen, Al. v. Oettingen gewidmet, Munich, 1898, pp. 113—124. — As to the adversaries of Priscillian the words of Isidore of Seville (De viris ill., c. 15) are worthy of note: Itacius Hispaniarum episcopus, cognomento et eloquio clarus, scripsit quendam librum sub apologetici specie, in quo detestanda Priscilliani dogmata et maleficiorum eius artes libidinumque eius probra demonstrat. This Itacius is sometimes identified with Idacius of Emerita, and again with Ithacius of Ossonoba. In 1528 *Sichard* made public under the name of Idacius Clarus Hispanus a work Contra Varimadum Arianum which *Chifflet* (1664) wrongly entitled

Contra Marivadum Arianum, and printed among the works of Vigilius of Tapsus (*Migne,* PL., lxii. 351—434); cf. *G. Ficker,* Studien zu Vigilius von Tapsus, Leipzig, 1897, pp. 46 ff. — Anti-Priscillianist likewise, in all probability, was the work of *Olympius,* a Spanish bishop of the fourth century: Adversus eos qui naturam et non arbitrium in culpam vocant (*Gennad.,* De viris ill., c. 23; cf. *Augustinus,* Contra Julianum, i. 8); cf. *Künstle,* Antipriscilliana, pp. 162 168. — Towards the middle of the fifth century the bishops Pastor and Syagrius (in Gallecia in the North-West of Spain) undertook a campaign against Priscillianism, the former in a compendium of ecclesiastical doctrine (*Gennad.,* l. c., c. 76), the latter in a dogmatico-speculative work De fide (*Gennad.,* l. c., c. 65). *Morin* who made the discovery, is of opinion that the anti-Priscillianist Profession of faith erroneously attributed to a Council of Toledo (*Denzinger,* Enchiridion symbolorum et definitionum, 7. ed., n. 113—131, following *Hefele,* Konziliengeschichte, 2. ed., ii. 306—308) is in reality the work of Pastor. *Künstle,* in his Antipriscilliana, § iv (pp. 40—45): Der «Libellus in modum symboli» des Bischofs Pastor aus Galläzien, proves this to be the fact. The work of Syagrius might also be recovered, he thought, through a more careful study of the manuscripts; cf. Revue Bénédictine (1893), x. 385—394; (1895), xii. 388; (1902), xix. 237—242, where Morin shows that in the days of Gennadius Syagrius was accounted the author of the pseudo-Vigilian treatise De Trinitate (§ 87, 4). On Syagrius see *Künstle,* Antipriscilliana, pp. 126—128, and 142—159. On the treatise «De Trinitate» see *Künstle,* ib., p. 184. — There is still extant a letter of Turibius, bishop of Astorga, written to his fellow-bishops Hydatius (Idacius) and Ceponius about 446, in which he denounces the blasphemous contents of the Priscillianist apocrypha. It may be read among the works of Leo the Great (*Migne,* PL., liv. 693 to 695). For the life of St. Turibius see *V de Buck,* in Acta SS. Oct. (Paris, 1883), xiii. 226 ff., and for the editions of his letter, *Schoenemann,* Bibl. hist.-lit. Patr. lat. ii. 1060 ff. See also *Künstle,* Antipriscilliana, passim.

4. PHILASTRIUS. — About the year 383 probably, the literature of the Latin Church was enriched by a modest counterpart of the Haereses of Epiphanius (§ 71, 2). This was the *Liber de haeresibus*[1] composed by Philastrius, bishop of Brixia (Brescia), who died before 397 Instead of the 80 heresies of Epiphanius our author enumerates 156, of which 28 are pre-Christian, the other 128 are Christian heresies. In Philastrius, even more than in Epiphanius, we note the absence of any clear definition of the essentials of a heresy[2]. The relationship between the two works does not result from the use of Epiphanius by Philastrius, but from their mutual dependence on the Syntagma of Hippolytus (§ 54, 3).

Philastrius was first edited by *J. Sichard,* Basel, 1528. *Gallandi,* Bibl. vet. Patr. vii. 475—521, and *Migne,* l. c., reprint the edition of *P. Galeardi,* Brescia, 1738. The last edition is that of *Fr. Marx,* Vienna, 1898 (Corpus script. eccles. lat. xxxviii). Cf. *Th. Zahn,* Gesch. des neutestamentl. Kanons (1890), ii 1, 233—239: «Aus Philaster von Brescia.» The sources of Philastrius are discussed by *R. A. Lipsius,* Zur Quellenkritik des Epiphanios, Vienna, 1865, 4 ff; *Id.,* Die Quellen der ältesten Ketzergeschichte neu untersucht, Leipzig, 1875, pp. 91 ff. *Fr. Marx,* Über die Trierer Handschrift des Filastrius, 1904, pp. 44—105. *P C. Furet,* Etude grammaticale sur le

[1] *Migne,* PL., xii. 1111—1302. [2] *Aug.,* Ep. 222, ad Quodvultdeum, c. 2.

latin de S. Filastrius (Dissert.), Erlangen, 1904. — Gaudentius, successor of Philastrius in the see of Brescia, († 410 or 427), composed at the request of a certain Benivolus a little collection of his homilies (*Migne,* PL., xx. 827—1002), in all 21 tractatus; the last one treats De vita et obitu B. Philastrii. The Carmen ad laudem B. Philastrii (*Migne,* PL. xx. 1003—1006) is a spurious work. Gaudentius is the subject of an extensive treatment at the hands of *Nirschl,* Lehrbuch der Patrologie und Patristik ii. 488—493. For the diction of his tractatus cf. *K. Paucker,* in Zeitschr. f. die österreich. Gymnasien (1881), xxxii. 481.

## § 90. St. Ambrose.

1. HIS LIFE. — Auxentius, the Arian bishop of Milan, owed it to the favor of Valentinian I., in spite of such opponents as Hilary of Poitiers (§ 86, 13) that he was able, to maintain himself in office until his death in 374. The choice of a successor led to scenes of violence between Arians and Catholics. In order to calm the agitation, Ambrose, the newly appointed consularis or governor of Emilia and Liguria (Northwestern Italy), appeared in the church, whereupon both parties as though yielding to higher inspiration, immediately united in choosing him. He was the son of noble Christian parents, born probably at Trier about 340, where his father (also called Ambrose) was praefectus praetorio Galliarum. His father died while Ambrose was still young, and the mother returned with her three children to Rome. Ambrose was the youngest, and according to the family traditions was destined for political life. His superior abilities brought about his rapid advancement; in 374, at the latest, he was governor of Northern Italy, having his residence at Milan. He was also still a catechumen, i. e. unbaptized, when chosen bishop of that city. All his resistance was in vain: Quam resistebam ne ordinarer! postremo cum cogerer, saltem ordinatio protelaretur! sed non valuit praescriptio, praevaluit impressio[1]. He was baptized at his own request by an orthodox Catholic priest, Nov. 30., 374, but it is not known who consecrated him bishop, Dec. 7., 374. One of his first cares was to perfect his theological education: Factum est ut prius docere inciperem quam discere; discendum igitur mihi simul et docendum est, quoniam non vacavit ante discere[2] Under the direction of the priest Simplicianus, afterwards his successor, he devoted himself to the study of the Christian writings, principally the works of the Greek Fathers: among the earlier ones Clement of Alexandria and Origen, among his contemporaries Basil and Didymus the Blind. His own writings show that he must have read very diligently also the works of the Jew Philo. On accepting the burden of the episcopate he distributed among the poor his great riches, and was thenceforth a model of unselfish and devoted pastoral charity. He was easily accessible to all men: non enim vetabatur quisquam ingredi aut ei

[1] *Ambr.,* Ep. 63, 65 [2] *Ambr.,* De offic., i. 1.

venientem nuntiari mos erat[1], unless, indeed, the crowd of his petitioners prevented access to him: secludentibus catervis negotiosorum hominum, quorum infirmitatibus serviebat[2]. He was ever gladsome with the glad, and sorrowful with the sorrowful: gaudens cum gaudentibus et flens cum flentibus[3]. His own tears drew tears from his penitents: ita flebat ut et illum flere compelleret[4]. Ambrose was highly gifted as an orator, whence the remarkable influence exercised by his homilies and discourses. No less a judge than Augustine has written: Verbis eius suspendebar intentus et delectabar suavitate sermonis[5]; per illius os potissimum me Dominus ab errore liberavit[6]. The words of Ambrose were eagerly listened to elsewhere than in the Cathedral of Milan. His episcopal action forms an essential part of the history of his time. The rulers of the empire were under his all-powerful influence. The young emperor Gratian (375—383) exhibited a filial devotion towards the great bishop, whose impress is clearly marked on all the principal events of that reign. Through Justina, the mother and guardian of the youthful Valentinian II., Arianism had again lifted its head. But the fearless and firm Ambrose opposed with success all the intrigues of this powerful and vindictive princess. At the same time he gave proof of his loyalty to the reigning house by interceding, at the request of Justina, with Maximus, the assassin of Gratian and usurper of his throne. He went twice to Trier for this purpose, in 383—384, and again in 386—387. After the death of his mother, in 388, Valentinian became still more intimate with Ambrose. It was the influence of the bishop of Milan that caused the young emperor to resist with firmness the petition of the Roman Senate for the restoration of the Altar of Victory to its ancient place in the Senate-House, whence in 382 Gratian had caused it to be removed. Valentinian was murdered, May 15., 392 by Arbogast at Vienne in Gaul; Ambrose had already received his appeal for help, and was hastening to his royal friend and disciple when he heard mid-way in his journey the sad news of the emperor's death. Theodosius the Great (379—395) was also very friendly and trustful towards Ambrose; it was only for a brief time that the intimacy of their relations seemed threatened. Even in the presence of Theodosius, Ambrose maintained the absolute independence of the Church, both internal and external. As a member of the Christian community the only privilege of the emperor should be to lend his strong right arm to the Church, and to protect her rights. In 388 the Christians of Callinicum in Mesopotamia had destroyed a Jewish synagogue, for which act Theodosius took severe measures against the citizens of that place; at the request of Ambrose the emperor withdrew his edict. It was also at the instance of Ambrose that the

[1] *Aug.*, Conf., vi. 3. [2] Ib. [3] *Paulinus*, Vita S. Ambros., c. 39.
[4] Ib. [5] Conf., v. 13. [6] Ep. 147, 23.

emperor did public penance for the massacre of Thessalonica in 390, the citizens of which had been guilty of the murder of several imperial officials: stravit omne quo utebatur insigne regium, deflevit in ecclesia publice peccatum suum gemitu et lacrymis oravit veniam[1]. Theodosius died Jan. 17., 395, and was soon followed by Ambrose, April 4., 397

2. AMBROSE AS A CHRISTIAN WRITER. — There would be reasonable cause to marvel at the great number of works left us by St. Ambrose, in spite of his extensive and manifold cares as bishop and statesman, were it not for the fact that most of these writings are the mature expression of his official life and labors. It is true that, so far as we know, very few of his homilies or discourses have reached us in their original form, or precisely as he delivered them. At the same time it has been observed that most of his «books» are really homilies, somewhat altered for publication, but even still easily recognizable as what they were. They are nearly all practical and exhortatory in contents and method. The thoughts are usually taken from Holy Scripture, particularly the Old Testament, but in the mouth of Ambrose these sacred texts are made to reflect every phase of the religious and moral life of man. Even in works that are not the outcome of his homiletic preaching, Ambrose loves to dwell on the moral side of Christian life and teaching; he is a genuine Roman in whom the ethico-practical note is always dominant. He has neither time nor taste for philosophico-dogmatic speculations. In all his writings he aims at some practical purpose. Hence he is often content to reproduce what has been already treated, to turn over for another harvest a field already worked. He often draws abundantly from the ideas of some earlier writer, Christian or pagan, but adapts these thoughts with tact and intelligence to the larger public of his time and his country. In formal perfection his writings leave something to be desired; a fact that need not surprise us when we recall the demands made on the time of such a busy man. His diction abounds in unconscious reminiscences of classical writers, Greek and Roman; he is especially conversant with the writings of Vergil. His style is in every way peculiar and personal, and is never wanting in a certain dignified reserve. When it appears more carefully studied than is usual with him, its characteristics are energetic brevity and bold originality. Those of his writings that are homiletic in origin and form naturally show the great oratorical gifts of Ambrose; in them he rises occasionally to a noble height of poetical inspiration. His hymns are a sufficient evidence of the complete mastery that he possessed over the Latin language.

3. EXEGETICAL WRITINGS. — More than half of his writings are exegetical, in the sense that their text is biblical (see no. 2) without

[1] *Ambr.*, De obitu Theodosii oratio, c. 34.

however any specific intention of formally commenting the scriptural passages under consideration. We shall briefly describe these writings, according to the sequence of the biblical books and as they are found in the current editions of Ambrose. There is still much uncertainty as to their chronological sequence. The history of creation, as told in Genesis, is the subject of: Hexaemeron libri sex[1], one of the most important of the writings of Ambrose, made up from nine homilies delivered on six consecutive days, perhaps in 389, certainly after 386. De paradiso[2], De Cain et Abel libri duo[3], De Noe et arca[4], were probably written in close chronological order, perhaps about 376—379. Kellner attributes De Noe et arca to the end of 386. Its text presents a number of hiatus. The history of the patriarchs is treated in the works: De Abraham libri duo[5], De Isaac et anima[6], De bono mortis[7], De fuga saeculi[8], De Jacob et vita beata libri duo[9], De Joseph patriarcha[10], De benedictionibus patriarcharum[11] All these writings seem to belong to the years 388—390. The De Isaac et anima is thus entitled because the story of Isaac and Rebecca is expounded as typical of the relations of Christ to the human soul. De bono mortis is a continuation of the former work, as the author himself declares, and aims at demonstrating that death is no evil, but rather a benefit. In the De fuga saeculi he discusses the flight of Jacob into Mesopotamia. The blessing given by Jacob to his sons is the subject of the Benedictiones patriarcharum. The Lenten fast of forty days is the subject of the homilies collected in: De Elia et ieiunio[12]. In *De Nabuthe Iezraelita*[13] he thunders against the avarice of the rich (3 Kings xxi), and in *De Tobia*[14] against usury. The historian of contemporary Roman life finds an abundant harvest in these three works, the first and second of which were certainly written after 386. In the: De interpellatione Job et David libri quattuor[15], written according to the Maurine editors about 383, he discusses the doubtings and complainings of Job and David in the matter of the misfortunes of the good and the happiness of the impious. In the: Apologia prophetae David[16], written about 383—385, he undertakes to diminish the scandal of David's double sin (adulterium et homicidium). The: Apologia altera prophetae David[17], written with a similar intention, is very probably spurious. Quite unlike the preceding works are the:

[1] *Migne,* PL., xiv. 123—274. [2] Ib., xiv. 275—314.
[3] Ib., xiv. 315—360. [4] Ib., xiv. 361—416.
[5] Ib., xiv. 419—500. [6] Ib., xiv. 501—534.
[7] Ib., xiv. 539—568. [8] Ib., xiv. 569—596.
[9] Ib., xiv. 597—638. [10] Ib., xiv. 641—672.
[11] Ib., xiv. 673—694. [12] Ib., xiv. 697—728.
[13] Ib., xiv. 731—756. [14] Ib., xiv. 759—794.
[15] Ib., xiv. 797—850.
[16] Ib., xiv. 851—884; the additional ad Theodosium Augustum is not original
[17] Ib., xiv. 887—916.

Enarrationes in duodecim Psalmos Davidicos (Ps. 1 35—40 43 45 47 48 61)[1], written at different times, and: Expositio in Psalmum 118[2], written probably about 386—388. In both works there is a stricter application of the exegetical method. The: Commentarius in Cantica canticorum[3] was compiled from scattered utterances of Ambrose, and also from long excerpts of a formal commentary on the Canticle of canticles, by the Cistercian monk Wilhelm of St. Theodorich near Reims († 1148). The: Expositio Esaiae prophetae has perished; the fragments of it collected among the writings of St. Augustine may be read in the Ballerini edition (ii. 895—898). The: Expositio Evangelii secundum Lucam libris decem comprehensa[4], the longest work of St. Ambrose, was not written before 388, though composed from earlier homilies. Since the sixteenth century the origin of the: Commentaria in tredecim epistolas B. Pauli[5] has been much discussed, it is a remarkable work both in contents and form. The still uncertain author declares, apropos of 1 Tim. iii. 15, that St. Damasus (366—384) was then (hodie) the reigning pope. In one of his works[6] St. Augustine quotes some words of this commentary (Rom. v. 12) under the name of Sanctus Hilarius; at the same time it can be the work neither of Hilary of Poitiers nor of Hilary of Rome (§ 87, 5). In the fifteenth and the sixteenth centuries the work was attributed to St. Ambrose. In deference to the objections of Erasmus, the author has since then been known as Ambrosiaster or Pseudo-Ambrosius, nor has any progress been made in our knowledge of his personality. Apropos of the exegetical works of Ambrose, mention may be made of the: Lex Dei sive Mosaicarum et Romanarum legum collatio (not found in the editions of St. Ambrose), a work in which an attempt is made to exhibit the Mosaic legislation concerning the more common delinquencies as the basis of the Roman legislation. Mommsen, the latest editor (1890), rejects the Ambrosian authorship of the work. We have already described the Pseudo-Hegesippus (§ 88, 9).

4. EXEGETICAL WRITINGS (CONTINUED). — The peculiar coloring of the exegetical writings of St. Ambrose is owing to his allegorico-mystical interpretation of the Scripture-text. He is wont not to stop at the letter, but proceeds at once to recognize a certain deeper or higher sense to which he devotes all his attention. Under his hand the slightest external details, circumstances apparently the most insignificant in a biblical event are transformed and made to offer most profound and valuable instruction for the faith and the life of Christians. He does not undertake to justify or elaborate his method; only occasionally does he insist on its value and its necessity He distinguishes a double scriptural sense (littera and sensus altior). Accord-

[1] Ib., xiv. 921—1180. [2] Ib., xv. 1197—1526.
[3] Ib., xv. 1851—1962. [4] Ib., xv. 1527—1850.
[5] Ib., xvii. 45—508. [6] Contra duas epistolas Pelagianorum, iv. 14.

ing to its contents or subject-matter, the scriptural sense is triple: sensus naturalis (natural truths), sensus mysticus (mysteries of faith), and sensus moralis (moral precepts). St. Jerome long ago took note of the relation of dependency between Ambrose and Origen (§ 39, 5). Concerning the Hexaemeron of the former, Jerome says[1] that he so worked over (sic compilavit) the Hexaemeron of Origen, ut magis Hippolyti sententias Basiliique sequeretur. He means that Ambrose took the work of Origen as his model, but in many details of the execution rather inclined to the views of Hippolytus and Basil; this he did because he knew how unreliable the great Alexandrine often was. It is also homilies of St. Basil that were used by Ambrose for the: De Elia et ieiunio, De Nabuthe Jezraelita, and De Tobia. At the same time it may be said that the principal source of his allegorico-mystical interpretation of the Old Testament is the Jewish writer Philo, the tractates of the latter are the unmistakable basis of the Ambrosian writings: De paradiso, De Cain et Abel, De Noë et arca, De Abraham, and others. So numerous are the echoes and reminiscences of Philo scattered through these writings that very often successful attempts have been made to reconstruct from the works of Ambrose the much corrupted text of Philo. It is to be noted, however, that Ambrose never abandons his Christian standpoint. From the Jew he has merely learned how to read into the narrative of Genesis a doctrinal sense that he has first acquired elsewhere. He applies the same method to the New Testament. In the commentary on St. Luke the biblical text is made to serve purposes of instruction and edification, but with a thorough ignoring of all the rules of hermeneutics, and frequently in so forced and artificial a manner as to make it hard to follow with any ease the mental process of the interpreter.

5. ASCETICO-MORAL WRITINGS. — The most important, though not the earliest of the moral treatises of Ambrose, is his work in three books: De officiis ministrorum[2], a counterpart of Cicero's three books De officiis. It was written after 386. Cicero had composed his work for his son Marcus; even so Ambrose composed his treatise for his spiritual sons, the ecclesiastics or ministers (ministri) of the Church: sicut Tullius ad erudiendum filium, ita ego quoque ad vos informandos filios meos[3]. Like Cicero also, he had in view a far wider circle of readers. It was his purpose to prepare a manual of morality for all Christians. In the order and disposition of his doctrine he follows the great Roman very closely; nevertheless, the antithesis between the philosophical morality of the pagan and the morality of the Christian churchman is remarkably striking. In his exhortations, particularly, Ambrose shows an irresistible power. He also wrote a

[1] Ep. 84, 7. [2] *Migne*, PL., xvi. 23—184. [3] De offic., i. 7.

series of works concerning virginity or relating to the state of consecrated Christian virgins. Indeed, he treated this theme so often and with such effect that not a few protested with tears and remonstrances: Virginitatem doces et persuades plurimis ., puellas nubere prohibes[1]. In 377, at the request of his beloved sister Marcellina, he collected a number of these discourses into three little books dedicated to her: De virginibus ad Marcellinam sororem suam[2]. The first book treats of the dignity and excellency of virginity, the second offers the consecrated virgin suitable instructions on her holy state, and the third contains some particular instructions for his sister. Of this little book, probably the first of all written by St. Ambrose, Jerome says: Tanto se effudit eloquio, ut, quidquid ad laudes virginum pertinet, exquisierit, expresserit, ordinarit[3] The same subject-matter recurs in: De viduis[4], written in 377 or 378; De virginitate[5], probably written also in the year 378; De institutione virginis et S. Mariae virginitate perpetua ad Eusebium[6], written in 391 or 392; Exhortatio virginitatis[7], composed in 393 or 394. As to the work or discourse: De lapsu virginis consecratae[8], Dom Morin thinks that it is really a work of Ambrose, but that owes its actual form to some one of his auditors.

6. DOGMATIC WRITINGS. — The five books: De fide ad Gratianum Augustum[9], were composed at the request of the young emperor. They contain a thorough and convincing defence of the true divinity of the Son against the objections of the Arians, the first two books were written in 378, the other three in 379 or 380. At the emperor's request he also composed, in 381, the three books: De Spiritu Sancto ad Gratianum Augustum[10] In them he defends the consubstantiality of the Holy Ghost; his masters and guides are Athanasius, Basil the Great, and Didymus the Blind. Arianism and the circle of Arians about Gratian gave rise, probably in 382, to another work: De incarnationis Dominicae sacramento[11]. He is not the author of a work often attributed to him: De fide orthodoxa contra Arianos[12] (cf. § 87, 4). In the second book of his Eranistes or Polymorphus, Theodoret of Cyrus has preserved a long excerpt from the *Expositio fidei* of Ambrose[13]. The: Explanatio symboli ad initiandos, is also genuine[14]; another recension of it may be seen elsewhere[15] We have already referred (§ 87, 2) to the spurious: Exhortatio S. Ambrosii episcopi ad neophytos de symbolo. There is no sufficient reason to doubt the genuineness of his *De mysteriis*[16], though the date of its composition is still uncertain. It is addressed to the newly baptized and

[1] De virginitate, c. 5. [2] *Migne*, PL., xvi. 187—232.
[3] Ep. 22, 22. [4] *Migne*, PL., xvi. 233—262. [5] Ib., xvi. 265—302.
[6] Ib., xvi. 305—334. [7] Ib., xvi. 335—364. [8] Ib., xvi. 367—384.
[9] Ib., xvi. 527—698. [10] Ib., xvi. 703—816. [11] Ib., xvi. 817—846.
[12] Ib., xvii. 549—568. [13] Ib., xvi. 847—850. [14] Ib., xvii. 1155—1160.
[15] Ib., lvii. 853—858. [16] Ib., xvi. 389—410.

treats of Baptism, Confirmation and the Eucharist. A close kinship of contents exists between the De mysteriis and the six books or discourses *De sacramentis*[1]. It is probable that the latter work is not a later imitation or recension of the De mysteriis, but the same work indiscreetly and in an imperfect form published by some auditor of Ambrose. In the two books *De poenitentia*[2], composed according to the Benedictine editors in 384, he refutes the teachings of the Novatians; the work abounds in valuable proofs of the power of the Church to remit sins, of the necessity of confession, and of the meritorious character of good works. St. Augustine frequently quotes from a lost work of Ambrose: De sacramento regenerationis sive de philosophia. Another work: Ad Pansophium puerum, written in 393—394, is known to us only by its title. He is not the author of the work published by Caspari in 1883: Altercatio S. Ambrosii contra eos, qui animam non confitentur esse facturam, aut ex traduce esse dicunt.

7. SERMONS AND LETTERS. — In the two books: De excessu fratris sui Satyri[3], he left to posterity a worthy memorial of his beloved brother and intimate companion who died suddenly in 379. The first book contains the sermon preached by Ambrose at the funeral of Satyrus; the second book, entitled: De fide resurrectionis, is a consolatory discourse preached at the tomb of his brother on the eighth day after the burial. More famous still are the funeral discourses on Valentinian II. and Theodosius the Great: De obitu Valentiniani consolatio[4], delivered in August 392, at the burial of the murdered emperor, and: De obitu Theodosii oratio[5], delivered Feb. 26., 395, during the solemn obsequies of the great emperor. Both of these discourses are held to be models of rhetorical composition, and are likewise historical authorities of prime importance. The: Sermo contra Auxentium de basilicis tradendis[6], belongs to the trying but glorious days of 386. A Scythian priest Mercurinus had been made bishop of Milan by the Arians under the name of Auxentius, whereupon Valentinian II., or rather his mother Justina, demanded the cession of a Catholic church for the use of Auxentius and the Arians, which request was energetically refused by Ambrose. About the same time he had the happiness to discover the bodies of the holy martyrs Gervasius and Protasius; in a letter to his sister Marcellina he inclosed two short discourses that he delivered on this occasion[7]. Very insignificant in contents, and of doubtful authenticity, are three discourses on Lk. xii. 33: Vendite omnia quae possidetis et date eleemosynam. They were first made known in

[1] *Migne,* PL., xvi. 417—462. [2] Ib. xvi. 465—524.
[3] Ib., xvi. 1289—1354. [4] Ib., xvi. 1357—1384.
[5] Ib., xvi. 1385—1406. [6] Ib., xvi. 1007—1018.
[7] Ep. 22: ib., xvi. 1019—1026.

1834 by De Corrieris, and are found in the Ballerini edition[1] of Ambrose. Mention has already been made of many other exegetical, dogmatic, and ascetico-moral discourses. — The Benedictine editors enumerate (1690) 91 letters of Ambrose[2] and believed themselves justified in affixing a date to most of them (1—63). Though the number of the letters has not grown, very useful work was done by *Ihm* in 1890 in order to ascertain their chronology. Some of these letters are confidential in nature and personal in character; most of them, however, are official communications, memorials on public affairs, synodal reports, and the like. They are entitled to a place among the most important of contemporary historical authorities, and they afford abundant evidence of the distinguished position and great influence that the writer had in Church and State.

8. HYMNS AND OTHER POEMS. — The hymns deserve a special notice. The example of his Arian rivals moved him to compose religious chants which he caused to be sung by the people during divine service. The earliest and most important reference to these hymns dates from the year 386, when in reply to a reproach of the Arians he wrote as follows: Hymnorum quoque meorum carminibus deceptum populum ferunt. Plane nec hoc abnuo. Grande carmen (= a great charm) istud est quo nihil potentius. Quid enim potentius quam confessio Trinitatis quae quotidie totius populi ore celebratur! Certatim (= alternatively?) omnes student fidem fateri, Patrem et Filium et Spiritum Sanctum norunt versibus praedicare. Facti sunt igitur omnes magistri, qui vix poterant esse discipuli[3] By this introduction of the hymns into the liturgical service Ambrose enriched and developed it according to the manner of his Oriental contemporaries. The pious custom spread from Milan through all the Western churches. A new kind of religious chants arose known as «Ambrosian Hymns» — they were composed after the manner of his hymns, or rather (to be more precise) they were sung in the churches after the Ambrosian manner. St. Isidore of Seville says of them: Hymni ex eius [Ambrosii] nomine Ambrosiani vocantur. Carmina autem quaecumque in laudem Dei dicuntur hymni vocantur[4]. Four Ambrosian hymns are vouched for as authentic by historical evidence, and in particular by the testimony of St. Augustine. They are: Aeterne rerum Conditor, Deus Creator omnium, Iam surgit hora tertia, Veni Redemptor gentium. These hymns are composed in iambic dimeters and arranged in strophes of four verses each. The meter is scrupulously correct and the laws of quantity rigorously observed; the diction is at once lucid and simple, elevated and grave. A fifth hymn, to Saints Gervasius and Protasius, exhibits intrinsic evidence of the authorship of Ambrose; the writer calls

[1] v. 195—222. [2] *Migne*, PL., xvi. 876—1286.
[3] Sermo contr. Aux., c. 34. [4] *Isid. Hisp.*, De eccl. off., i. 6.

himself the *repertor* (see no. 7) of their bodies. Milanese tradition, as sifted and verified by Biraghi (1862) and Dreves (1893), guarantees the Ambrosian authorship of another series of hymns. — It used to be believed that, on the occasion of the baptism of St. Augustine by St. Ambrose in 387, they were divinely inspired to sing alternately the canticle known as the *Te Deum laudamus*. It is certain that this hymn is not the work of these writers, but early in the sixth century, however, it was already a well-known hymn. Dom Morin attributes it to Nicetas of Remesiana (see no. 12). Ambrose composed also some metrical inscriptions for churches and for the tombs or monuments of departed friends (tituli). A cycle of 21 distichs composed in explanation of a series of paintings on the walls of the Cathedral of Milan and first edited by Juretus in 1589, is declared spurious by some; but Biraghi (1862) and Merkle (1896) maintain that these distichs are genuine.

9. COMPLETE EDITIONS. VERSIONS OF SELECT WRITINGS. — Among the earlier editors of the writings of Ambrose, the most successful, admittedly, were *J. du Frische* and *N. Le Nourry*. Their edition appeared at Paris, 1686—1690, 2 vols. The second volume contains a large Appendix with separate pagination, in qua post triplicem eiusdem S. Doctoris vitam continentur varii tractatus suppositii. This edition was twice reprinted at Venice, 1748—1751, 4 vols.; 1781—1782, 8 vols. It is reprinted in *Migne,* PL., Paris, 1845 and 1866, xiv—xvii. With the aid of Milanese manuscripts a new edition was brought out by *P. A. Ballerini,* Milan, 1875—1883, 6 vols. *M. Ihm* is correct when he writes, Studia Ambrosiana (see no. 11) p. 13: Plane Maurinorum studiis subnititur, quorum diligentiam et acumen in sua ipse editione assecutus non est. So far only three volumes of the Vienna edition have appeared (Corpus script. eccles. lat. xxxii). They are edited by *K. Schenkl* and contain exegetical writings of Ambrose. The third volume is entitled. Expositio evangelii secundum Lucam. Rec. *K. Schenkl.* Opus auctoris morte interruptum absolvit *H. Schenkl,* Vienna, 1902. — Select writings of St. Ambrose were translated into German by *Fr X. Schulte,* Kempten, 1871—1877, 2 vols. (Bibl. der Kirchenväter), into English by *H. de Romestin,* A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, series II, vol. x, New York, 1896.

10. SEPARATE EDITIONS. TRANSLATIONS. INVESTIGATIONS. — *Exegetical works:* In Studia Ambrosiana (see no. 11) pp. 95—119, *M. Ihm* has contributed emendations to the text of Expositio in Ps. 118, with the aid of an eleventh-century Trier codex. *Ballerini* has lately (iii. 349 ff.) defended the Ambrosian authorship of Ambrosiaster. *J. Langen,* De commentariorum in epist. Paulinas qui Ambrosii, et quaestionum biblicarum quae Augustini nomine feruntur scriptore (Progr., Bonn, 1880), is of opinion that the latter work belongs to the Luciferian Faustinus (§ 87, 3): he would likewise be the author of Quaestiones Veteris et Novi Testamenti (*Migne,* PL., xxxv. 2213—2416; the latter work is found among the writings of St. Augustine). Anonymi, vulgo Ambrosiastri, commentaria in epistolas Pauli ex codice Casin. n. 150, saec. vi, omnium vetustissimo, in Spicilegium Casinense (1901), iii 11, 383 f. *A. Souter,* The Genuine Prologue to Ambrosiaster on 2 Corinthians, in Journal of Theological Studies (1902—1903), iv. 89 to 92. *C. Marold* (in Zeitschr. f. wissenschaftl. Theol., 1884, xxvii. 415—470) maintains that the author known as Ambrosiaster is not identical with the author of the Quaestiones, but he does not attempt to solve the problem

of the former's personality. In the Revue d'hist. et de littérat. religieuses, 1899, iv. 97—121, *G. Morin* proposes as the author of both works the converted Jew Isaac, who lived in the latter half of the fourth century and is known as the author of a very insipid Liber fidei de sancta trinitate et de incarnatione Domini (*Migne*, PG., xxxiii. 1541—1546, cf. *Gennad.*, De viris ill., c. 26). A later article of *Morin*, Hilarius l'Ambrosiaster, in Revue Bénédictine (1903), xx. 113—124, suggests as author of both works Decimus Hilarianus Hilarius, an illustrious layman of the latter part of the fourth century; he would also be the author of Contra Arianos (§ 86, 7). *F. Cumont*, La polémique de l'Ambrosiaster contre les païens, with an appendix. L'Ambrosiaster et le droit romain, in Revue d'hist. et de litt. religieuses (1903), viii. 417—440. *C. H. Turner*, Niceta and Ambrosiaster, in Journal of Theol. Studies (1906), vii. 203—219 355—372; *Id.*, Ambrosiaster and Damasus, ib., vii. 281—284. To Isaac are also attributed the Expositio fidei, by *C. P. Caspari*, in Kirchenhistorische Anecdota, Christiania, 1883, i. 304—308, and Gesta inter Liberium et Felicem episcopos, in the Collectio Avellana, edited by *O. Günther* (Corpus script. eccles. lat. xxxv), pp. 1—5; cf. *F. Wittig*, Papst Damasus I., Rome, 1902, passim. *Th. Mommsen* prepared an edition of the Collatio legum Mosaicarum et Romanarum, in Collectio librorum iuris anteiustiniani, edd. *P. Krüger, Th. Mommsen, G. Studemund*, Berlin, 1890, iii. 107—198. The pertinent litterature is in *Teuffel-Schwabe*, Gesch. der röm. Litt., 5. ed., p. 1124. — *Ascetico-moral books:* De officiis ministrorum was edited separately by *F. G. Krabinger*, Tübingen, 1857. It was translated into German by *C. Haas*, Die Pastoralschriften des hl. Gregor d. Gr. und des hl. Ambrosius von Mailand, übersetzt, Tübingen, 1862, pp. 271 ff., also by *Schulte*, Kempten, 1877 (see no. 9); cf. *F. Hasler*, Über das Verhältnis der heidnischen und christlichen Ethik auf Grund Vergleichung des Ciceronianischen Buches De officiis mit dem gleichnamigen des hl. Ambrosius, Munich, 1866. *P. Ewald*, Der Einfluß der stoisch-ciceronianischen Moral auf die Darstellung der Ethik bei Ambrosius (Inaug.-Diss.), Leipzig, 1881. *R. Thamin*, St. Ambroise et la morale chrétienne au IV^e^ siècle, Paris, 1895. *Th. Schmidt*, Ambrosius, sein Werk De officiis libri iii, und die Stoa (Inaug.-Diss.), Göttingen, 1897. On the De lapsu virginis consecratae see no. 12. *Th. Chiuso*, Gli scritti di S. Ambrogio sopra la verginità messi in lingua italiana, 2. ed., Turin, 1885. — *Dogmatic writings: G. Mercati*, Le titulationes nelle opere dogmatiche di S. Ambrogio, in Ambrosiana (see no. 11). *Th. Schermann*, Die Kapitelüberschr. der dogmatischen Bücher des hl. Ambrosius, in Röm. Quartalschr. (1902), xvi. 353—355; *Id.*, Die griechischen Quellen des hl. Ambrosius in Lib. iii de Sp. Sancto, Munich, 1902. Some of the dogmatic writings of Ambrose were reprinted by *H. Hurter* in his Ss. Patr. opusc. sel. (series 1): De poenitentia t. v; De mysteriis t. vii; De fide ad Gratianum Augustum t. xxx. The last named work is contained also in the Bibliotheca Sanctorum Patrum, series V, vols. v vi, Rome, 1905 1906. For the history of the Explanatio symboli ad initiandos see *C. P. Caspari*, Ungedruckte Quellen zur Geschichte des Taufsymbols und der Glaubensregel, Christiania, 1869, ii. 48—127 For the De mysteriis and De sacramentis cf. *F. Probst*, Liturgie des 4. Jahrhunderts und deren Reform, Münster, 1893, pp. 232—239. *Th. Schermann*, Die pseudo-ambrosianische Schrift «De Sacramentis». Ihre Überlieferung und Quellen. In Röm. Quartalschr. (1903), xvii. 36—55 237—255. The booklet on the origin of the soul is found in *Caspari*, Kirchenhistorische Anecdota, Christiania, 1883, i. 225—247; cf. ib., pp. xi—xiii. — *Sermons: K. Schenkl*, Sancti Ambrosii de excessu fratris liber prior, in Ambrosiana (see no. 11). In his Spicilegium Liberianum, Florence, 1863, pp. 3—4, *Fr. Liverani*

edited a spurious Tractatus in Phil. iv. 4, under the name of Ambrose. Selections from the sermons of Ambrose were translated into German by *Th. Köhler,* Leipzig, 1892, in *G. Leonhardi,* Die Predigt der Kirche, xx. — *Hymns:* The metrical writings of Ambrose are discussed by *L. Biraghi,* Inni sinceri e Carmi di S. Ambrogio, vescovo di Milano, Milan, 1862. *G. M. Dreves,* S. J., Aurelius Ambrosius, der Vater des Kirchengesanges. Eine hymnologische Studie (Supplement 58 of Stimmen aus Maria-Laach), Freiburg, 1893. An Italian version of the hymns was made by *G. Breta,* Milan, 1841. P. Franchi de' Cavalieri denies in his Sant' Agnese nella tradizione e nella leggenda, Rome, 1899 (supplement of the Röm. Quartalschrift) the Ambrosian authorship of the hymn Agnes beatae virginis. It is defended by *G. M. Dreves,* in Zeitschrift f. Kath. Theologie (1901), xxv. 356—365. *A. Steier,* Untersuchungen über die Echtheit der Hymnen des Ambrosius, in Jahrb. f. klass. Philologie 1903, xxviii. For a study on six of the Ambrosian hymns and the Te Deum laudamus cf. *J. Kayser,* Beiträge zur Geschichte und Erklärung der ältesten Kirchenhymnen, 2. ed., Paderborn, 1881, pp. 127—248 and 435—458. On the Te Deum see no. 12. The metrical inscriptions and the distichs are discussed by *Biraghi,* l. c.; the latter are the subject of a study by *S. Merkle,* in Röm. Quartalschrift f. christl. Altertumskunde u. f. Kirchengesch. (1896), x. 185—222. In Analecta sacra et classica, Paris, 1888, part 1, pp. 121—124, *Pitra* edited certain Ambrosiani qui dicuntur versus de naturis rerum. *M. Magistretti,* Monumenta veteris liturgiae Ambrosianae, I: Pontificale in usum ecclesiae Mediolanensis necnon et Ordines Ambrosiani ex codicibus saec. xi—xv. II et III: Manuale Ambrosianum. Milan, 1897—1905.

11. WORKS ON ST. AMBROSE. — *C. Locatelli,* Vita di S. Ambrogio, Milan, 1875. *Fr Böhringer,* Die Kirche Christi und ihre Zeugen oder die Kirchengeschichte in Biographien, 2. ed., vol. x: Ambrosius, Erzbischof von Mailand, 2. reprint, Stuttgart, 1877. *Th. Förster,* Ambrosius, Bischof von Mailand. Eine Darstellung seines Lebens und Wirkens, Halle, 1884. *Le Duc de Broglie,* St. Ambroise (340—397), Paris, 1899 (Les Saints); 4. ed., 1901. — *M. Ihm,* Studia Ambrosiana, in Jahrb. f. klass. Philol., Suppl., Leipzig, 1890, xvii. 1—124, also printed separately; cf. *Ihm,* Philon und Ambrosius, in Neue Jahrb. für Philol. und Pädag. (1890), cxli. 282—288. — Ambrosiana, Scritti varii pubblicati nel xv. centenario della morte di S. Ambrogio, con introduzione di *A. C. Card. Ferrari,* Milan, 1897. *J. E. Pruner,* Die Theologie des hl. Ambrosius (Progr.), Eichstätt, 1862. *W. Balkenhol,* Die kirchenrechtlichen Anschauungen des hl. Ambrosius, Bischofs von Mailand, und seiner Zeit, in Der Katholik, 1888, i. 113—140 284—296 337—381 484—511; reprinted separately. *J. B. Kellner,* Der hl. Ambrosius, Bischof von Mailand, als Erklärer des Alten Testamentes, Ratisbon, 1893. *H. Dacier,* La femme d'après Saint Ambroise, Paris, 1900. *M. Magistretti,* Il sacramento della confessione secondo S. Ambrogio, in Scuola Cattolica, 1903, pp. 493—512. *A. Largent,* Saint Ambroise, in Dict. de Théologie Catholique, Paris, 1903, i. (col. 942—951); *P. Lejay,* Rit Ambrosien, ib. (col. 954—968); *F. Niederhuber,* Die Lehre des hl. Ambrosius vom Reiche Gottes auf Erden (in Forschungen z. christl. Litt.- u. Dogmengesch., iv. 3—4), Mainz, 1904; *F. van Ortroy,* Saint Ambroise et l'empereur Théodose, in Analecta Bollandiana, 1904, pp. 417—426. *N. Ermoni,* Saint Ambroise, hymnographe (col. 1347—1352); *H. Leclercq,* Compositions épigraphiques de Saint Ambroise (col. 1352—1353); *A. Galard,* Chant Ambrosien (col. 1353—1373); *P. Lejay,* Rit Ambrosien (col. 1373—1442), these four articles in: Dict. d' Archéologie chrétienne et de Liturgie, Paris, 1906, i.

12. NICETAS OF REMESIANA. — Nicetas, bishop of Romatiana or Remesiana in the heart of Dacia, lived towards the end of the fourth century, and

must not be confounded with the bishop of Aquileia of the same name in the second half of the fifth century. According to Gennadius (De viris ill., c. 22) he left an instruction for baptismal candidates written in simple and pleasing style: Competentibus ad baptismum instructionis libellos sex, and a work: Ad lapsam virginem libellum. The contents of the books of baptismal instruction were as follows: Continet primus (libellus) qualiter se debeant habere competentes secundus est de gentilitatis erroribus tertius liber de fide unicae maiestatis, quartus adversus genethliologiam (astrology), quintus de symbolo, sextus de agni paschalis victima. This work does not seem to be preserved in its entirety. The fifth book (De symbolo) is certainly identical with the Explanatio symboli habita ad competentes (*Migne,* PL., lii. 865—874), first edited by Cardinal *Borgia* (Padua, 1799), a very beautiful work and very important for the history of the baptismal creed. It has been re-edited by *Caspari* (Kirchenhistorische Anecdota, Christiania, 1883, i. 341—360), and by *Pitra* (Analecta sacra, Paris, 1883, iii. 584—588). Other remnants of this instruction were edited by *M. Denis* (Vienna, 1802) and by Cardinal *Mai* (Rome, 1827 1833). *Denis* made known six short fragments (*Migne,* PL., lii. 873—876), and *Mai* three brief treatises, (ib., lii. 847—866), entitled: De ratione fidei, De Spiritus Sancti potentia, De diversis appellationibus D. N. Jesu Christo convenientibus. The first two treatises are certainly parts of one book, and probably identical with De fide unicae maiestatis, the third book of the Instruction. Textual emendations of the De diversis appellationibus are found in *G. Mercati,* Note di letteratura biblica e cristiana antica (Studi e Testi, v), Rome, 1901, pp. 137—140. For more details on various other fragments and especially the Explanatio symboli cf. *E. Hümpel,* Nicetas, Bischof von Remesiana (Inaug.-Diss.), Erlangen, 1895. *F. Kattenbusch* does not admit that these fragments, especially the Explanatio symboli, belong to the bishop of Remesiana. They were written, he thinks, in Gaul or in Spain in the early part of the fifth century; cf. Theol. Literaturzeitung, 1896, pp. 297—303. Gennadius vouches for a work of Nicetas entitled Ad lapsam virginem; in the past it was often identified with the De lapsu virginis consecratae among the works of Ambrose (see no. 5). *Dom Morin* discovered lately a hitherto unknown Epistola ad virginem lapsam, which is more likely to be the work attributed by Gennadius to Nicetas (Revue Bénédictine, 1897, xiv. 193—202). *Morin* undertook also to show that the data in Gennadius concerning the literary labors of the bishop of Remesiana are incomplete. On the other hand, there is scarcely any reason to doubt that Nicetas of Remesiana is identical with Nicetas, bishop in Dacia, and friend of St. Paulinus of Nola (*Kattenbusch,* l. c., does not think so). Paulinus often makes mention of him in his poems and letters as a missionary bishop and a well-known hymnographer; cf. *Paulinus of Nola,* Poema 17: ad Nicetam redeuntem in Daciam. *A. Souter,* Notes on the De lapsu virginis of Niceta, in Journal of Theol. Studies (1905), vi. 433—434. From a close study of the words of Paulinus *Morin* has been able to render it most probable that Nicetas is the author of the Te Deum Laudamus (see no. 8 10), as well as of two hymnological treatises De vigiliis servorum Dei and De psalmodiae bono (*Migne,* PL., lxviii. 365—376). On the history of the Te Deum cf. *Morin,* in Revue Bénéd. (1894), xi. 49—77 337—345; *A. E. Burn,* An Introduction to the Creeds and to the Te Deum, its structure and meaning, its musical setting and rendering, together with a revised Latin text, notes and translations, London, 1902; *G. Semeria,* Gli Inni della Chiesa, iii: L'Inno della fide. *W Meyer,* Das Turiner Bruchstück der ältesten irischen Liturgie, in the Göttinger Nachrichten, philol.-hist. Klasse, 1903, pp. 208—214. For the two hymnological treatises see *Morin,* in Revue Biblique (1897), vi. 282

to 288, and in Revue Bénédictine (1897), xiv. 385—397, where the entire text of De psalmodiae bono was first made known.

13. CONTEMPORARY EPISCOPAL WRITERS. — Pope Siricius (384—398) is known to us through seven letters (*Migne,* PL., xiii. 1131—1196), the first of which is addressed to Himerius, bishop of Tarragona in Spain (ib., xiii. 1131—1147). It is rather long and is also the oldest known of the decretal letters of popes; cf. *Jaffé,* Regesta Pontif. Rom., 2. ed., Leipzig, 1885, i. 40—42, n. 255—272. For a German version of these letters see *S. Wenzlowsky,* Die Briefe der Päpste (Bibl. der Kirchenväter), ii. 407 to 488. — St. Simplicianus, the friend of St. Ambrose and his successor in the see of Milan, left many letters (*Gennad.,* De viris ill., c. 36), among them several to St. Augustine. They have all perished. Among the letters of St. Augustine there is a very flattering letter ad Simplicianum, written about 397 (Ep. 37: *Migne,* PL., xxxiii. 151—152). He also wrote a work De diversis quaestionibus ad Simplicianum libri duo (Ib., xl., 101—148). — Among the prominent theologians of the time was Chromatius, bishop of Aquileia (ca. 387—407); eighteen of whose treatises have reached us. They are homilies on the Gospel of St. Matthew (Ib., xx. 323—368); among them the treatise on the eight beatitudes (Ib., 323—328) has always been highly esteemed. These treatises deal with three chapters (iii. 15 to 17 and v vi) of the said Gospel, and appear to be fragments of an entire series of homilies on Matthew. — Vigilius, bishop of Trent, died a martyr about 405; we have from his pen a work De martyrio SS. Sisinnii, Martyrii et Alexandri (Ib. xiii. 549—558). — Victricius, bishop of Rouen, died about 407; one of his sermons (De laude sanctorum; ib. xx. 443 to 458) has reached us. A new edition was brought out by *Sauvage* and *Tougard,* Paris, 1895. *E. Vacandard,* Saint Victrice, évêque de Rouen, Paris, 1903 (Les Saints); *Id.,* in Revue des questions historiques (1903), lxxiii. 379—441.

### § 91. Prudentius and Paulinus.

1. PRUDENTIUS. — Aurelius Prudentius Clemens is easily the foremost among the Latin poets of Christian antiquity. In the *Praefatio* of his complete poems he describes for us summarily his life and his writings. Prudentius was born in Spain in 348, very probably at Cæsaraugusta (Saragossa), of a very illustrious Christian family His youth was not free, he tells us, from «the stains and mire of sin» nequitiae sordibus ac luto[1]. He chose the career of public office which he entered as procurator, and was twice named rector or president of a province, his native province, it is conjectured. Finally, through the favor of Theodosius, he was given a military office, or rather was admitted among the highest imperial officers — the exact value of the words *militiae gradu evectum* used by him in the Praefatio, vv. 19—20, is not certain. His «whitening locks» (nix capitis, Praefatio, v. 27) moved him to exchange the splendor of the imperial court for a peaceful solitude that he might live in closer communion with God and save his soul. Early in the fifth century he made a journey to Rome. His death must have taken place a few years after his return to Spain. — In his fifty-seventh year (404 or 405),

[1] Praef., v. 12.

Prudentius published a collection of his writings that has come down to us in numerous manuscripts. Towards the end of the Praefatio he indicates as follows the contents and tendency of his works: «The sinful soul should at last put away its folly, and glorify God in accents of praise if not by meritorious actions. The soul should spend its days in the singing of hymns, and let no night go by without praising the Lord. It should wage war against heresies, preach the Catholic faith, overthrow the altars of the demons, break down thy idols, O Rome, consecrate pious canticles to the martyrs, and sing to the Apostles discourses filled with praise». The collection is divided into seven books, six of which bear Greek titles. The first book contains a number of daily hymns and is known as *Cathemerinon (καθημερινῶν) liber;* seven of its twelve hymn-like canticles (in nine metres) are devoted to as many hours of the day and to the regulation of daily actions, while five are destined for certain days of the week or year. The sixth book is also lyrical in character and is known as the *Peristephanon (περὶ στεφάνων) liber,* because its fourteen canticles celebrate in divers metres the praises of Christian martyrs of Spain and Italy (Rome). Both works follow closely the old Spanish liturgy, and it is on them that the fame of the poet rests. His song, enhanced by a rich and imaginative diction, springs from the very depths of his soul and rises on the wings of firm faith and tender affection. If we except Claudian, he is as consummate an artist in verse as any of his pagan contemporaries. Prudentius is rightly reproached with excess and crudeness of detail in the pictures of martyrdom met with in the Peristephanon. He wrote three other metrical works of a didactico-polemical character. Of these, the *Apotheosis (ἀποθέωσις)* defends the true divinity of Jesus Christ against the Patripassians, the Sabellians, and the Jews. The *Hamartigenia (ἁμαρτιγένεια)* fixes the origin of evil in the free will of the creature as against the Gnostic, and particularly the Marcionite dualism. The *Libri duo contra Symmachum* are devoted to an attack on idolatry and the proceedings of the pagan party in the Roman Senate as represented by Symmachus († ca. 405). This last work was composed at Rome in 402—404; it glows with enthusiasm and by modern critics has frequently been declared the most perfect work of the poet. Our ignorance of the circumstances that gave birth to the Apotheosis and the Hamartigenia makes it difficult to appreciate them properly. Rösler is of opinion (1886) that both of them were written principally against Priscillianism (§ 89, 3); Rösler sees a similar polemical purpose in the *Psychomachia (ψυχομαχία)*, a lively and highly-colored description of the «struggle for the soul» between Christian virtues and pagan vices. The poem is written in hexameters, and is sometimes described as a didactic work, and again as an epic, because of the fulness in its manner of treating its sub-

ject. It is the first Western example of a purely allegorical poem and exercised a profound influence on all mediæval symbolism. Merkle (1894) does not admit the anti-Priscillianist tone of these three works. Künstle (1905) maintains that all were written against Priscillianism. The last poem of the collection is known as the *Dittochæon*, and describes forty-nine biblical scenes, twenty-four from the Old and twenty-five from the New Testament, each of them in 4 hexameters. It is quite probable that all these Tetrasticha are explications or even inscriptions that graced corresponding pictorial scenes on the walls of the Church (at Saragossa?) The term «Dittochæon» is still obscure; it is usually, but not satisfactorily explained as «double nourishment», from διττός and ὀχή i. e. from the Old and the New Testament.

2. WRITINGS ON PRUDENTIUS. — The oldest and best codex of Prudentius is Cod. Paris. 8084, saec. vi. (cf. § 88, 7) in uncial capitals. The Italian codices are described by *A. Dressel* in his edition of Prudentius (Leipzig, 1860), pp. xlvi—lxi. *E. O. Winstedt*, The double Recension of the Poems of Prudentius, in Classical Review (1903), xvii. 203—207. The illuminated manuscripts of the Psychomachia are described by *R. Stettiner*, Die illustrierten Prudentius-Handschriften, Berlin, 1895. — The various editions of Prudentius are enumerated by *Dressel*, l. c., pp. xxv—xlvi. Among the earlier editions that of the Jesuit *F. Arevalo* (Rome 1788 to 1789, 2 vols.) deserves mention because of its copious and learned commentary. It is reprinted in *Migne*, PL., lix—lx, Paris, 1847. — *Lanfranchi*, Aurelii Prudentii Clementis opera, ad Bodonianam editionem exegit, variis lectionibus et adnotatiunculis illustravit, Turin, 1896 1902, 2 vols. The Apotheosis is reprinted also in *Hurter*, SS. Patr. opusc. sel. xxxiii. Excellent complete editions of Prudentius are due to *Th. Obbarius*, Tübingen, 1845, and *A. Dressel*, Leipzig, 1860. The eleventh hymn of the Peristephanon (Passio Hippolyti) was edited separately with an Italian version by *Fr. Felli*, Viterbo, 1881. Dressel indicates (pp. lxii—lxiv) the various vernacular versions of our poet. A good German version is found in the work of *Cl. Brockhaus*, Leipzig, 1872. Selected poems were translated into English by *Francis St. John Thackeray*, Translations from Prudentius, London, 1890. *Cl. Brockhaus*, Aurelius Prudentius Clemens in seiner Bedeutung für die Kirche seiner Zeit, Leipzig, 1872. *Ad. Ebert*, Allgem. Geschichte der Literatur des Mittelalters im Abendlande (2. ed., 1889), i. 251—293. *J. Kayser*, Beiträge zur Geschichte und Erklärung der ältesten Kirchenhymnen, 2. ed., Paderborn, 1881, pp. 249—336. *A. Rösler*, Der katholische Dichter Aurelius Prudentius Clemens, Freiburg, 1886. *Aimé Puech*, Prudence, Paris, 1888. *G. Boissier*, La fin du paganisme, Paris, 1891, ii. 123—177 (3. ed. [1898], pp. 105—151). *M. Manitius*, Gesch. der christlich.-latein. Poesie, Stuttgart, 1891, pp. 61—99. *A. Tonna Barthet*, Aurelio Prudencio Clemente. Estudio biográfico crítico, in Ciudad de Dios (1902), lvii—lix. — *Fr. Krenkel*, De Aurelii Prudentii Clementis re metrica (Diss. inaug.), Rudolstadt, 1884. *H. Breidt*, De Aurelio Prudentio Clemente Horatii imitatore (Diss. inaug.), Heidelberg, 1887. *A. Melardi*, Quid rationis Prudentii Psychomachia cum Cebetis tabula habere videatur, Potenza, 1901. *E. B. Lease*, A syntactic, stylistic and metrical study of Prudentius, Baltimore, 1895. *G. Sixt*, Die lyrischen Gedichte des Aurelius Prudentius Clemens (Progr.), Stuttgart, 1889.

*V. Both*, Des christlichen Dichters Prudentius Schrift gegen Symmachus (Progr.), Rastatt, 1882. *S. Merkle*, Prudentius und Priscillian, in Theol. Quartalschr. (1894), lxxvi. 77—125; *Id.*, Neue Prudentius-Studien, ib. (1896), lxxviii. 251—275; *Id.*, Prudentius' Dittochæum, in Festschrift zum elfhundertjährigen Jubiläum des deutschen Campo Santo in Rom, Freiburg, 1897, pp. 33—45. *J. P. Kirsch*, Le «Dittochæum» de Prudence et les monuments de l'antiquité chrétienne, in Atti del II congresso di archeol. crist., Rome, 1902, pp. 127—131. *A. Melardi*, La Psychomachia di Prudenzio, poema eroico-allegorico del v. secolo, Pistoia, 1900. *P. Chavanne*, Le patriotisme de Prudence, in Revue d'hist. et de littér. religieuses (1899), iv. 332—352 385—413. — The remaining «literature» on Prudentius is listed and criticised by *C. Weyman*, in Jahresbericht über die Fortschritte der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft (1895), lxxxiv. 297—300; (1897), xciii. 205—208; (1900), cv. 84 f. *F. Maigret*, Le poète chrétien Prudence, in Science Catholique (1903), xvii. 219—227 303—313. *K. Künstle* shows that Prudentius wrote against Priscillian, in Antipriscilliana, Freiburg, 1905.

3. PAULINUS OF NOLA. — Contemporary with Prudentius, but quite different in character, was another poet, Pontius Meropius Anicius Paulinus, born in 353 at Burdigala (Bordeaux) of a wealthy senatorial family. He was a disciple of the rhetorician Ausonius (§ 88, 5), and through life remained bound to him by ties of reverent love and friendship. Paulinus owed it to the powerful influence of his friend that after the death of Valens (Aug. 9., 378), though scarcely twenty-five, he was made consul subrogatus for the remainder of that year. He seems to have soon retired from public life to devote himself to a literary dilettantism more pleasing to his tastes. However, his soul found true peace only when he listened to the voice of divine grace and stripped himself of all his earthly possessions. It was only gradually that he formed this resolution, grave trials had nourished and confirmed it; in the meantime he had to overcome the prayers and reproaches of his master. He had long deferred baptism, but in 389 he received it from the hands of Delphinus, bishop of Bordeaux, after which he lived some years on his estates in Spain. In 393, after much resistance, he was ordained priest by Lampius, bishop of Barcelona, and the following year (394) retired to Nola in Campania. It was the resting-place of the holy martyr Felix, whom in his early youth Paulinus had chosen as his protector, and to whom he believed himself indebted for his escape from an accusation of fratricide. Hither he came with his pious wife Therasia to lead a life of prayer, mortification, and voluntary poverty When the see of Nola fell vacant in 409, he was chosen to be its bishop, and thenceforth, to his death in 431, gave an admirable example of self-sacrifice and disinterested devotion to works of Christian charity — Paulinus has not the fire and strength of Prudentius, his poetry betrays a milder and gentler nature. He lacks the creative force of the Spaniard, his bold flights of imagination, the splendor of his diction. The style of Paulinus is more simple and calm, also more orna-

mental and pleasing, and manifests at all times a cultivated sense of beauty. From the earlier period of his life we possess but a few insignificant poems. A special interest attaches to the correspondence of Paulinus and Ausonius, especially the letters that belong to the period of the former's conversion (389—393). In these letters both authors reached the acme of their poetical inspiration. Ausonius strives to shake the resolution of his disciple to enter upon a new life, while the latter, in spite of the inevitable discrepancy between sound faith and unreflecting frivolity, manifests a dignified attachment to his old master and friend. Among the poems of the latter part of the life of Paulinus the most important, both in length and contents, are the panegyrical effusions in honor of St. Felix. For at least fourteen consecutive years, beginning with 394, Paulinus honored each feast-day of his Saint (January 14.) with such a composition in hexameters. We have still thirteen of these *Carmina natalitia* in which Paulinus celebrates the day of the Saint's death, considered as the day of his birth to eternal life; a fourteenth carmen has reached us in fragmentary condition. Of his three paraphrases of Psalms (Ps. i ii cxxxvi, in the Vulgate) the first is in iambic trimeters, the second and third in hexameters; in them he created a new form of Christian poetry, destined to be thenceforth much cultivated both in mediæval and modern times. The *Epithalamium Juliani et Jae* is an interesting Christian nuptial poem in 120 distichs, and contains much historical material of value for the manners and habits of his time. The letters of Paulinus are less pleasing than his poems; their style is somewhat labored and pedantic, and they are overrich in biblical quotations and allusions. About 50 of them have reached us; thirteen of them are addressed to his oldest and dearest friend Sulpicius Severus, six to Amandus, a priest of Bordeaux, to whom he tells us he was particularly indebted for the grace of conversion; five to Delphinus, bishop of the same city; four to Augustine, and one each to most of his other correspondents. Several prose-works of Paulinus have perished, notably a panegyric on Theodosius: Super victoria tyrannorum, eo maxime quod fide et oratione plus quam armis vicerit, also a: Liber de poenitentia et de laude generali omnium martyrum[1].

4. WORKS ON PAULINUS. — Complete editions of his works were published by the Jesuits *Fronton du Duc* and *Heribert Rosweyde*, Antwerp, 1622; *J. B. Le Brun des Marettes*, Paris, 1685, 2 vols.; *L. A. Muratori*, Verona, 1736 (in *Migne*, PL., lxi), and lately by *W. v. Hartel*, Vienna, 1894, 2 vols. (Corpus script. eccl. lat., xxix—xxx); cf. *Hartel*, Patristische Studien, Vienna, 1895, v vi. — *Muratori* added to the former editions four unknown works, three of them being Carmina natalitia in S. Felicem and one a poem of two hundred and fifty-four hexameters against the follies of idolatry, addressed to a certain Antonius. In *Gallandi*, Bibl. vet. Patr., iii. 653—661 (cf. xlviii—xlix) this Carmen ad Antonium follows

[1] *Gennad.*, De viris ill., c. 48.

the Instructiones of Commodian, under the title: Antonii carmen adversus gentes. *Gallandi* took for granted that the first line; Discussi, fateor, sectas, Antonius, omnes, was equivalent to a claim for authorship by Antonius; *Muratori* showed quite clearly that it is the vocative and not the nominative which occurs here, also that St. Paulinus is the real author of these verses, which are reprinted in *Migne,* PL., v. 261—282, under the title and after the order of *Gallandi*, as an appendix to the Instructiones of Commodian and as Antonii Carmen adversus gentes. The work is especially important for classical mythology and archæology, and has been twice edited separately, by *Fr. Oehler,* in *Gersdorf,* Bibl. Patr. eccl. lat. sel., Leipzig, 1849, xiii. 121—132, and by *C. Bursian,* in Sitzungsberichte der philos.-philol. und histor. Klasse der kgl. bayer. Akad. der Wissensch., Munich, 1880, fasc. i, pp. 1—23. Both of these editors accept the authorship of Paulinus. — A polymetric poem of 130 verses, interpretative of some paintings, and entitled Obitus Baebiani, was published as early as the sixteenth century, but has only lately been shown by *W Brandes* to be a work of Paulinus of Nola; cf. the excellent new edition of *Brandes,* in Wiener-Studien (1890), xii. 280—297. There ought no longer to be any doubt of the authorship of Paulinus; cf. *Manitius,* l. c., pp. 298—300. *O. Bardenhewer,* in Katholik (1877), i. 493—510, and *C. Weyman,* in Histor. Jahrb. (1895), xvi. 92—99 (cf. ib., 423 f.), made known a new letter of St. Paulinus; it is really a continuation of the one numbered 25 in his correspondence. — For Paulinus in general cf. *Ad. Buse,* Paulin, Bischof von Nola, und seine Zeit (350—450), Ratisbon, 1856, 2 vols. *F. Lagrange,* Histoire de St. Paulin de Nole, Paris, 1877, 2. ed., 1882, 2 vols. *M. Lafon,* Paulin de Nole, pp. 353—431. Essai sur sa vie et sa pensée (Thèse), Montauban, 1885. *G. Boissier,* La fin du paganisme, ii. 57—121 (3. ed., pp. 49—103). *Manitius,* l. c., pp. 261—297 *A. Huemer,* De Pontii Meropii Paulini Nolani re metrica, Vienna, 1903. — For the correspondence of the poet see *A. Puech,* De Paulini Nolani Ausoniique epistularum commercio et communibus studiis (Thèse), Paris, 1887. *A. Baudrillart,* Saint Paulin, évêque de Nole, 1904. *M. Phillip,* Zum Sprachgebrauch des Paulinus von Nola (Diss.), I. Teil, Munich, 1904. — Uranius, a disciple of Paulinus, has left us a letter entitled De obitu Paulini ad Pacatum (*Migne,* PL., liii. 859—866); the recipient Pacatus is probably identical with the Latin rhetorician Drepanius Pacatus of Aquitania (*Teuffel-Schwabe,* Gesch. der röm. Litt., 5. ed., pp. 1085 ff.); in any case he intended to write a metrical life of Paulinus (vitam eius versibus illustrare: Ep. Uranii, c. 1).

5. OTHER POETS. — Toward the end of the fourth century the Gallic rhetorician, Severus Sanctus Endelechius, a friend of St. Paulinus of Nola (Ep. xxviii, 6), wrote in thirty-three asclepiadic strophes a graceful eclogue De mortibus boum (*Migne,* PL., xix. 797—800), under the title De virtute signi crucis Domini. The poet imagines that a cattle-pest carries off in two days the entire herd of Bucolus; Tityrus had made the sign of the cross on the forehead of each of his beasts, and thus saved them all. Bucolus and his friend Aegon are moved by this marvel to embrace Christianity. The latest edition is that of *Bücheler* and *Riese,* in Anthologia Latina, Leipzig, 1869—1897, i 2, 314—318. — The Greek title of an hexameter poem Alethia (ἀλήθεια), in three books, based on the Genesis-account of creation and reaching to the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrha (Gen. xix. 28), reminds us of Prudentius. It amplifies the biblical narrative extensively, and in so doing gives evidence of literary ability and good taste. It has reached us in only one manuscript, Cod. lat. Par. 7558 saec. ix., in which the author is frequently called Claudius

Marius Victor (Victorius) orator Massiliensis; he is certainly the same as Victorius (Victorinus) rhetor Massiliensis mentioned by Gennadius (De viris ill., c. 60) who died after 425. The first editor *J. Gagnejus* (Lyons, 1536; Paris, 1545) entitled the work Commentarii in Genesin, and most capriciously altered the text by additions, suppressions and the like; all other reprints are based on this edition, even *Migne,* PL., lxi. 937—970. The latest and best edition is that of *K. Schenkl,* in Poetae christiani minores, Vienna, 1888 (Corpus script. eccl. lat. xvi), i. 335—498 (the text of Gagnejus is found at pp. 437—482). In the same codex the Alethia poem is followed by a S. Paulini epigramma, a satirical dialogue in one hundred and ten hexameters descriptive of contemporary manners. It is probable that the author may be Paulinus of Biterrae (Béziers) who flourished about 400 to 419 (cf. *Hydatii* Chronicon ad a. 419). Gagnejus gave the work an utterly unsuitable title: Claudii Marii Victoris oratoris Massiliensis de perversis suae aetatis moribus liber quartus ad Salmonem (*Migne,* PL., lxi. 969 to 972). The latest and best edition is that of *K. Schenkl,* l. c., pp. 499 to 510. — Claudius Marius Victor is the subject of several works: *A. Bourgoin,* De Claudio Mario Victore, rhetore christiano quinti saeculi (Thèse), Paris, 1883. *St. Gamber,* Un rhéteur chrétien au V^e^ siècle, Claudius Marius Victor, Marseilles, 1884; *Id.,* Le livre de la Genèse dans la poésie latine au V^e^ siècle, Paris, 1899. *H. Maurer,* De exemplis quae Claudius Marius Victor in Alethia secutus sit (Diss. inaug.), Marburg, 1896. — About 430 the priest Cælius (?) Sedulius, concerning whom we possess very insufficient data, composed an hexameter poem entitled Paschale carmen (*Migne,* PL., xix. 533—754) dealing with the wonderful deeds of our Lord. In the dedication to a certain priest Macedonius he explains this title in conjunction with the words of the New Testament: quia pascha nostrum immolatus est Christus (1 Cor. v. 7). It is divided into five books, the first of which is introductory and explains certain miracles of the Old Testament; in the other four the Gospel-narrative, in particular the text of St. Matthew, furnishes the material for a description of the miracles of Christ from His Incarnation to His Ascension. Unlike his predecessor Juvencus (§ 88, 1), Sedulius relates only the miraculous elements of the life of Christ, which again he prefers to illustrate by his comments rather than to narrate. The work of Sedulius was highly appreciated and was very popular throughout the Middle Ages by reason of its pronounced ecclesiastical tone, its peculiar exegesis, and the simplicity and vigor of its diction. At the request of the same Macedonius, another work, Paschale opus (ib., xix. 545 to 574), was composed by Sedulius; it is a kind of amplification in rhetorical prose of the foregoing work; the strained and affected style of this prose work contrasts strangely with that of the metrical composition. Sedulius also wrote two hymns to our Lord (ib., xix. 753—770); portions of the second hymn have been adopted into the liturgy of the Church: the Christmas hymn: A solis ortus cardine, and the Epiphany hymn: Crudelis Herodes Deum; cf. *J. Kayser,* Beiträge zur Gesch. und Erklärung der ältesten Kirchenhymnen, 2. ed., Paderborn, 1881, pp. 337—385. For the spurious cento De Verbi incarnatione (ib., xix. 773—780) cf. § 88, 4. The best and latest complete edition of Sedulius is that of *J. Huemer,* Vienna, 1885 (Corpus script. eccles. lat. x). In the edition of *J. Looshorn* (Munich, 1879) the Paschale opus is lacking. On the Paschale carmen see also *Hurter,* SS. Patr. opusc. sel. xxxiii; cf. *J. Huemer,* De Sedulii poetae vita et scriptis commentatio, Vienna, 1878. *C. L. Leimbach,* Patristische Studien, i: Caelius Sedulius und sein Carmen paschale (Progr.), Goslar, 1879. Cf. on Sedulius also *A. Bellesheim,* Die Geschichte der kath. Kirche in Irland, Mainz, 1890, i. 285—291. Cf. also *Manitius,* l. c., p. 303.

*J. Candel,* De clausulis a Sedulio in eis libris qui inscribuntur Paschale opus adhibitis, Toulouse, 1904. — About 430, apparently, Orientius of Gaul (bishop of Auch?) wrote a Commonitorium (ib., lxi. 977—1000) or exhortatory poem in favor of a Christian life; its two books are composed in an unaffected but earnest style. Some minor poems are current under his name (ib., lxi. 1000—1006); most of them are of doubtful authenticity. The newest and best edition of Orientius is that of *R. Ellis,* in Poetae christiani minores, Vienna, 1888, i. 191—261. Cf. *Manitius,* l. c., pp. 192—201. *L. Havet,* Orientiana, in Revue de Philologie (1902), xxvi. 146—157. *R. Ellis,* The Commonitorium of Orientius, Oxford, 1903, p. 120. *L. Bellanger,* Le poème d'Orientius. Edition critique. Etude philologique et littéraire, Paris, 1903; *Id.,* Recherches sur S. Orens, évêque d'Auch (1903), i. 6. — The so-called Amoenus is not a poet at all, not even a person; all the poems attributed to him (ib., lxi. 1075—1082) belong to others. Cf. *Teuffel-Schwabe,* Gesch. der römischen Lit., 5. ed., p. 1218.

### § 92. St. Sulpicius Severus and Tyrannius Rufinus.

1. SULPICIUS SEVERUS. — This youthful friend of Paulinus of Nola was one of the most polished and refined prose-writers of his time. He was born about 363, of a noble Aquitanian family[1]. In one of his letters (v. 5—6) Paulinus tells us that Sulpicius had been an eloquent lawyer and had married into a rich consular family. His wife died quite unexpectedly, and her loss so affected him that he suddenly (repentino impetu) abandoned the law-courts and his wealth for monastic solitude and poverty. Sulpicius himself tells us[2] that it was St. Martin of Tours, the great apostle of Western monasticism, who exhorted him to withdraw from the «adulation and the vices» of the world and to follow Paulinus in his total change of sentiments and manner of life. The statement of Gennadius[3] that Severus was a priest, has been doubted but without good reason; there is also some historical evidence for the other story that in his old age our writer was caught in the toils of Pelagianism, but recognized eventually that he had been the victim of an over-loquacious tongue, whereupon he condemned himself to the penance of a life-long silence. His death is said to have occurred about 420—425. The most useful of his writings is a Chronicle: Chronicorum libri duo, finished not earlier than 403, in which he narrates summarily the history of the Old Testament, but omits the New Testament, «in order that the dignity of its subject-matter may not suffer from scantiness of narration» (ii. 27, 3). He adds a compendium of ecclesiastical history as far as the year 400; its chief interest lies in the description of the Priscillianist controversies (ii. 46—51). In this work Sulpicius furnished the cultivated Christian public with a book of historical readings; at the same time he gave proof of an historico-critical sense and imitated with great success the historical style of such writers as

[1] *Gennad.,* De viris ill., c. 19. [2] Vita S. Martini, c. 25.
[3] De viris ill., c. 19.

Sallust and Tacitus. Nevertheless, the work did not commend itself to the taste of succeeding generations, it is seldom quoted in the Christian literature of a later period, and has reached us in a single manuscript. On the other hand, several works written in honor of St. Martin of Tours met with a more general welcome. His *Vita S. Martini* was written during the life-time of the Saint though not published till after his death († 397). Three letters: Ad Eusebium, Ad Aurelium diaconum, Ad Bassulam parentem (his mother in law), may be looked on as appendixes to the Life of Martin; in the latter two his death is described. Two *Dialogi,* the first of which is usually but wrongly separated into two, are devoted to a comparison of the miracles of St. Martin with those of the Egyptian monks and complete (Dial. ia, 23) the account given in the Vita. These writings were originally intended for popular circulation, and obtained at once a wide circulation; all later descriptions of the life and miracles of Martin draw largely on them (§ 112, 3; 117, 3), as literary compositions they are far inferior to the Chronica. Through fanatical admiration for his hero our author becomes an over-credulous miracle-hunter; moreover, in these writings the author has been negligent in his style[1]. Seven letters that bear his name are generally rejected because of the difference of style which they exhibit; it would be more prudent to admit as genuine the first two of these letters, which are also the longest: Ad Claudiam sororem suam, De ultimo iudicio and De virginitate. Gennadius tells us[2] that he wrote many edifying letters to his sister. The letters to Paulinus of Nola referred to by Gennadius have perished.

2. WORKS ON SULPICIUS SEVERUS. JULIUS HILARIANUS. — Complete editions of the works of Sulpicius Severus were brought out by *Victor Giselinus,* Antwerp, 1574; *Girolamo de Prato,* Verona, 1741—1754, 2 vols.; *C. Halm,* Vienna, 1866 (Corpus script. eccles. lat. i). — *J. Fürtner,* Textkritische Bemerkungen zu Sulpicius Severus (Progr.), Landshut, 1885. *Migne* reprints (PL., xx. 95—248) the de Prato edition, with the addition of the seven letters, but without the praefationes, dissertationes and observationes of de Prato. A separate edition of the Chronicle was issued by *Fr. Dübner,* Paris, 1851. An acute and learned criticism of the Chronicle was written by *J. Bernays,* Über die Chronik des Sulpicius Severus, Berlin, 1861, and reprinted in Gesammelte Abhandlungen von *J. Bernays,* herausgegeben von *H. Usener,* Berlin, 1885, ii. 81—200. Cf. *H. Gelzer,* Sextus Julius Africanus, Leipzig, 1885, ii 1, 107—121. The Vita S. Martini cum epistulis et dialogis was edited by *Fr. Dübner,* Paris, 1859 and 1890; the same works are found in *Hurter,* SS. Patrum opuscula selecta, xlviii. They were translated into German by *A. Bieringer,* Kempten, 1872 (Bibl. der Kirchenväter). A French translation of the Vita S. Martini was made by *R. Viot,* 2. ed., Tours, 1893. Cf. *A. Lavertujon,* Sulpice Sévère édité, traduit et commenté, Paris, 1896 1899, 2 vols. (the Chronicle). For a bibliography of St. Martin see *J. H. Reinkens,* Martin von Tours, der wundertätige Mönch und Bischof, Breslau, 1866, pp. 258—274. The Latin of

[1] Cf. the preface of the Vita. [2] De viris ill., c. 19.

Severus is discussed by *H. Goelzer,* Grammaticae in Sulpicium Severum observationes potissimum ad vulgarem latinum sermonem pertinentes (Thèse), Paris, 1883. *J. Schell,* De Sulpicio Severo Sallustianae, Livianae, Taciteae elocutionis imitatore (Diss. inaug.), Münster, 1892. For a general chronicle to 511 (Epitoma chronicorum Severi cognomento Sulpicii) lacking in the editions of Sulpicius, but falsely attributed to him, cf. *Teuffel-Schwabe,* Gesch. der röm. Lit., 5. ed., pp. 1138 f. The Carmina Sulpicio Severo tributa in *Migne,* PL., lxxiv. 671—674, are also spurious. — Quintus Julius Hilarianus, a bishop of proconsular Africa, composed toward the end of the fourth century a little work entitled De mundi duratione (ib., xiii. 1097—1106) and a treatise De die paschae et mensis (ib., xiii. 1105 to 1114). Writers on historical chronology praise the boldness and independent research of the first work; cf. *H. Gelzer,* Sextus Julius Africanus ii 1, 121—129. A new edition of De mundi duratione or De cursu temporum was published by *C. Frick,* Chronica minora, Leipzig, 1892, i. 153—174.

3. TYRANNIUS RUFINUS. — This writer shares with Sulpicius Severus a reputation for classical culture, without equalling the originality of the latter or the perfection of his style. He was born about 345 near Aquileia, and there in a monastery he received his early theological training, and it was also at Aquileia that he met with St. Jerome and learned to appreciate that learned man. The monastic life exercised a strong fascination over him, and in 371 he accompanied the Roman lady Melania on a journey to Egypt, the fatherland of monasticism. He dwelt for some time with the hermits of the Nitrian desert, and afterwards at Alexandria frequented the lectures of the blind Didymus who filled him with enthusiasm for the Greek Fathers, particularly for Origen. In 377 he followed his friend Melania to Jerusalem and took up his residence in a hermit's cell on Mount Olivet. About 390 he was ordained priest by John, bishop of Jerusalem. In the meantime Jerome had taken up his residence at Jerusalem. The friendly relations existing between them were soon interrupted by the Origenist controversies (§ 71, 1), Rufinus being unwilling to take sides against Origen. This was soon followed, however, by a reconciliation, and in 398 Rufinus returned to Italy. He translated at Rome the first book of the Apology for Origen written by Pamphilus (§ 45, 1), likewise the work of Origen *περὶ ἀρχῶν* (§ 39, 8). In his preface to the latter work he deemed it right to mention among the disciples and admirers of the great Alexandrine the name of Jerome as of one well-known to the entire West and universally respected. This act led to an bitter literary feud between the former friends. Jerome insisted that he had held in honor the exegetical works of Origen, but by no means his dogmatic writings. He brought out at once a new translation of the *περὶ ἀρχῶν*, in which he set aside the free paraphrase of Rufinus for an exact and literal translation of the most offensive passages of the original. Rufinus now defended his own orthodoxy (400—401)

in: Apologiae in Hieronymum libri duo, written in a somewhat embittered and even hostile temper. In the meantime Pope Anastasius called Rufinus to account for his defence of Origen, but seems to have been easily satisfied by the short: Apologia ad Anastasium Romanae urbis episcopum. After his departure from Rome (398) Rufinus busied himself at Aquileia with literary labors, until the Visigothic invasion compelled him to hasten southward. He died at Messina in Sicily, in 410. — Rufinus is best known as a translator of a number of Greek works into Latin. Several Christian Greek writings, among them the above-mentioned works of Origen and Pamphilus, have come down to us only in his translations. We have mentioned elsewhere his translations of the Clementine Recognitions (§ 26, 3), numerous biblico-exegetical writings and spurious dialogues of Origen (§ 39, 4, 45, 2), the *Sententiae* of Sextus (§ 56, 7), the Church History of Eusebius (§ 62, 2), several discourses and the monastic rules of St. Basil (§ 67, 14), several discourses of Gregory of Nazianzus (§ 68, 11), and several writings of Evagrius Ponticus (§ 70, 4). We may mention here the translation of Josephus' work on the Jewish War; it is not at all certain, however, that this translation is really his work. Rufinus translates with great freedom; he deals with his original, not only as a literary critic of its form but as a theological censor of its contents. Thus the Church History of Eusebius became in his hands a new work: he compressed the ten books of the Greek text into nine, and added two books that dealt with the events of 324—395. This *Historia ecclesiastica* thus constructed by Rufinus in the years 402—403 was the first Western attempt at a history of the Church; for depth of thought and accuracy of treatment it is far inferior to the Chronicle of Sulpicius Severus. The writings of the latter on St. Martin find a counter part in the *Vitae Patrum* of Rufinus, a work that was afterwards better known as *Historia eremitica* or *Historia monachorum.* This collection of biographies of Egyptian monks was made between 404 and 410. By some it is held to be an independent work based on the personal knowledge and reminiscences of Rufinus; by others it is said to be merely a version or a recasting of an earlier Greek work on the same subject (§ 79, 4). The: Vita S. Eugeniae virginis et martyris, attributed to Rufinus, is a spurious work. He wrote, at the request of Paulinus of Nola, an interpretation of the blessing of Jacob (Gen. xlix); according to Gennadius[1] it was an exposition of the patriarchal blessings in their triple sense: triplici i. e. historico, morali et mystico sensu (De benedictionibus patriarcharum libri duo). He has wrongly been credited with commentaries on the first seventy-five Psalms and on Osee, Joel and Amos. From a very early period his exposition of the Apostles' Creed (Commentarius in symbolum

[1] De viris ill., c. 17.

apostolorum) was highly esteemed; it is of considerable importance for the history of all ancient baptismal creeds. The two works *De fide,* one of which is extant only in twelve short anathematisms, were by mistake reckoned among his writings. His extensive correspondence, known to Gennadius[1], has perished.

4. WORKS ON RUFINUS. POPE ANASTASIUS. — There is no complete edition of Rufinus, i. e. of his translations and his own writings. The latter were first edited by *D. Vallarsi,* Verona, 1745 (the second volume that was to contain the Latin translations by Rufinus did not appear). This edition contains all the works mentioned above, but of the Historia Ecclesiastica only the last two books i. e. the continuation of Eusebius (*Migne,* PL., xxi, Paris, 1849). A new edition of the text of the Historia ecclesiastica has been brought out by *Ed. Schwartz* and *Th. Mommsen,* Die Kirchengeschichte (des Eusebius) mit der lateinischen Übersetzung des Rufinus, part I, books i—v, Leipzig, 1903 (Griech.-christl. Schriftsteller). The Libellus de fide is in *Migne,* PL., xxi. 1123—1124 and xlviii. 239—254, among the works of Marius Mercator. *F. Klein,* Über eine Handschrift des Nikolaus von Cues, Berlin, 1866, pp. 131—141, edited a collation of the Migne text of the Commentarius in symb. apost., with a codex Cusanus saec. xii., and published (pp. 141—143) from the same codex a profession of faith. Eiusdem (Rufini) dicta de fide catholica. The authorship of the Historia monachorum is fully discussed by *Dom Cuthbert Butler,* The Lausiac History of Palladius, University Press, Cambridge, 1898, i. 6—77. The Commentarius is discussed by *H. Bruell,* De Tyrannii Rufini Aquileiensis commentario in symbolum apostolorum i—ii (2 Progr.), Düren, 1872—1879; Bruell also translated it into German, Kempten, 1876 (Bibl. der Kirchenväter). *Pfoulkes* raised some doubts (1872) concerning the genuineness or the integrity of this work of Rufinus, which were shown to be groundless by *F. Kattenbusch,* Beiträge zur Geschichte des altkirchlichen Taufsymbols (Progr.), Giessen, 1892, pp. 27—32; *Id.,* Das apostolische Symbol, Leipzig, 1895, i. 102 f. On the spurious commentary on Psalms i—lxxv see § 111, 6. — Not to speak of spurious fragments, three letters of Pope Anastasius deal with the Origenist controversies; they are addressed to the bishops John of Jerusalem, Simplicianus of Milan, and Venerius of Milan. The first two are printed among the works of Rufinus in *Migne,* PL., xx. 65—76; the letter of John is also ib., xxi. 627—632 (among the works of Rufinus), and again among the works of Marius Mercator (ib., xlviii. 231—240); the letter to Simplicianus is also among the works of St. Jerome (ib., xxii. 772—774). The letter to Venerius was first edited by *C. Ruelens,* in Bibliophile Belge (1871), pp. 123—129, and again by *J. van den Gheyn,* in Revue d'histoire et de littér. religieuses (1899), iv. 1—12. For a German version of the letters of Anastasius, genuine and spurious, cf. *S. Wenzlowsky,* Die Briefe der Päpste (Bibl. der Kirchenväter), ii. 489—512.

## § 93. St. Jerome.

1. LIFE OF ST. JEROME TO 379. — Sophronius Eusebius Hieronymus was born at Stridon, a border city of Dalmatia and Pannonia, according to some in 331, according to others not before 340. He tells us himself[2] that he has been nourished from his cradle on Catholic

[1] L. c. [2] Ep. 82, 2.

milk. When about twenty years of age he was sent to Rome for the purpose of receiving a better education in its schools. Here he became an enthusiastic auditor of the discourses of the grammarian Aelius Donatus on the Latin classics, particularly Terence and Vergil. He learned Greek also, and read many writings of the Greek philosophers. He was particularly attracted to the study of rhetoric; its commanding influence is noticeable in all his works. He was already a savant in the best sense of the word, and devoted much time and labor (summo studio ac labore)[1] to the creation of a library. He did not entirely escape the immoral contagion of the great city; nevertheless, his naturally deep piety withdrew him from these youthful errors, and he was baptized by Pope Liberius, though it was then the custom to put off baptism to a more advanced age. From Rome he betook himself to Trier, one of the best universities in the West; it was here that he first experienced an attraction to the study of theology. We meet him later at Aquileia in a circle of youthful friends, who exercised no little influence on the pious inclinations of his heart and his eagerness for learning. For reasons unknown to us he left Aquileia and Italy, and began, with some friends, a long journey through the East visiting on the way Thrace, Bithynia, Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia and Cilicia. Late in the summer of 373, he arrived at Antioch. In this city a fever carried off a very dear friend of Jerome: ex duobus oculis unum partem animae meae[2]. He tells us in the same place that he fell a prey himself to several diseases: quidquid morborum esse poterat, that brought him to the edge of the grave. Wearied of the world and sighing for rest, he gave up his original design of reaching Jerusalem, and betook himself to the desert of Chalcis, «the Thebais of Syria», where for the next five years he was to lead a hermit's life. In the practice of the most severe penance he found the peace of mind he had been seeking; with his own hands he procured the necessaries of lifes and gradually took up again his learned occupations and literary enterprises. He was perhaps the first Western Christian to undertake the study of Hebrew under the guidance of a baptized Jew: «I alone know, and those who were then my companions, what labor this study cost me, how often I lost courage, how often I abandoned and again took up my purpose, moved by the thirst of knowledge. I thank God that I now enjoy the sweet fruits of the bitter seeds of my studies».[3]

2. JEROME AT CONSTANTINOPLE AND ROME (379—385). — The dogmatic controversies of this period profoundly agitated the Christians of Antioch, and their echoes reached even the depths of the Chalcis desert. It was apropos of them that the Saint wrote[4], about 378, to Pope Damasus requesting his opinion on the use of the words

[1] Ep. 22, 30. [2] Ep. 3, 3. [3] Ep. 125, 12.
[4] Ep. 15 16.

οὐσία and ὑπόστασις. In the meantime he grew weary of the conflict, and without awaiting the reply of Damasus returned from his solitude to Antioch where he was reluctantly ordained a priest, on condition that he might remain a monk i. e. be held free from pastoral cares[1]. It would seem that in the desert he had recognized his calling as that of an ecclesiastical scholar. From Antioch he journeyed to Constantinople, probably in 379, attracted by the reputation of Gregory of Nazianzus, from whom he received instruction in the science of biblical exegesis. In the imperial city he also met Gregory of Nyssa, and doubtless other Greek theologians of the East. At the same time he threw himself with enthusiasm into the study of the earlier Greek Fathers, especially Origen and Eusebius. Ecclesiastical business (ecclesiastica necessitas)[2] interrupted this period of leisure and drew him to Rome where a Council was being held (382) in the hope of terminating the Meletian schism at Antioch. Jerome took part in it by invitation, and remained at Rome in order to aid the pope in his replies to synodal communications of Eastern and Western churches[3]. While the synod in question seems to have had no appreciable results, this sojourn at Rome was of great importance for the future career of St. Jerome. Throughout Italy, and especially at Rome, complaints had long been heard of the innumerable differences in the current Latin biblical texts. Jerome was therefore requested by the pope to prepare a text that should thenceforth be the normal one; it was this commission that gave fixity of purpose and character to his studies in the following decades. He enjoyed the unbounded confidence of Damasus, and his position was now one of influence and dignity. All upright men held in high esteem the counsellor of the pope, the ecclesiastical savant whose vast learning was then unequalled, the ascetic who appeared in his writings as the apostle of self-renouncement and self-consecration to God. Noble ladies of the highest rank declared themselves his disciples, among them Marcella and Paula, both of ancient patrician race, both widows entirely devoted to the service of God and their neighbor, and both leaders in a social circle that shared their thoughts and views. He could scarcely hope to escape the banter, enmities, and insinuations of the opposite extreme of Roman society; indeed, public opinion gradually became unfavorable to him. Among the Roman clergy not a few had been deeply irritated by the pitiless criticism of their moral life that the Saint had expressed, even in his writings. It is likely, also, that his influence with Damasus roused envy; his admiration for Origen was moreover a cause for scandal. It came about that, although in the beginning of his sojourn at Rome he was quite unanimously held to be the proper successor of Damasus[4], public opinion had

[1] Contra Ioannem Hieros., c. 41. [2] Ep. 127, 7. [3] Ep. 123, 10.
[4] Ep. 45, 3.

been considerably modified before that pope's death (Dec. 10., 384). Siricius was chosen his successor, and Jerome began to think seriously of «returning from Babylon to Jerusalem»[1].

3. JEROME AT BETHLEHEM (386—420). — He began his journey in the August of 385; toward the end of autumn Paula followed him, with her (third) daughter Eustochium. From Antioch, where they met early in the following winter, they travelled together to Palestine, in order to satisfy their piety at the sites made holy by the life and sufferings of the Rèdeemer; thence they went to Egypt where they visited Alexandria and the monastic city in the Nitrian hills. On their return to the Holy Land they took up their residence at Bethlehem in the autumn of 386. In a few years a monastery of men and another of women arose, close to the manger in which Christ was born, the former under the guidance of Jerome, the latter governed by Paula. Shelters for pilgrims were also erected along the imperial highway that led to Bethlehem. Jerome began again at great expense and amid great difficulties the collection of a library; he also devoted himself anew to the study of Hebrew (and Aramaic) in which he took lessons, usually at night, from learned rabbis. In turn he taught the elements of Hebrew to others, particularly Paula and Eustochium, taught also theology to his own monks, and opened a school for the children of his more comfortable neighbors in which he did not disdain to explain the elements of grammar, and read with his pupils the Latin classics, especially Vergil. In the meantime his literary occupations multiplied. Sulpicius Severus, an eye-witness, thus describes[2] the life of Jerome: «He is for ever immersed in his studies and his books; neither day nor night does he take any rest; he is for ever occupied with reading or writing». Jerome had now reached a haven of peace, he had found what was lacking to him at Rome, and his correspondence at this period gives evidence of the deep satisfaction of his soul, notably his letter: Ad Marcellam, de sanctis locis[3]. The deplorable Origenist controversies of 398—404 were destined to disturb the peace of this paradise of Christian scholars. Until then Jerome had been a very ardent admirer of Origen; the authority of St. Epiphanius now caused him to abandon his former opinions concerning the great Alexandrine (§ 71, 1), and to come forth as a leader of the anti-Origenists. He felt it necessary to describe his former devotion to Origen as a very limited and conditional approval of his writings: Laudavi interpretem, non dogmatisten, ingenium, non fidem, philosophum, non apostolum; si mihi creditis, Origenistes numquam fui; si non creditis, nunc esse cessavi[4]. At the same time he entered into a polemical correspondence with John, bishop of Jerusalem, and with the friend of his youth, Rufinus (§ 92, 3).

[1] Ep. 45, 6; cf. 46, 11. [2] Dial., i. 9, 5. [3] Ep. 46.
[4] Ep. 84, 2 3.

The point at issue was less the teaching of Origen in those matters where he was at variance with the orthodox faith, than the personal question which of the disputants could rightly be accused of Origenism. The Pelagian troubles were another source of annoyance and conflict for the indefatigable champion of the Christian faith. The defenders of Pelagius replied with violence to the attacks of Jerome. Early in 416 a number of them, including monks and ecclesiastics, broke into his monastery, set fire to it, and maltreated the inmates; Jerome escaped by a hasty flight. He was now weary of life, though ever alert in mind and ready for the fray. Many cares and sorrows filled his declining years; he quitted this world for eternal peace September 30., 420.

4. HIS TRANSLATION OF THE SCRIPTURES. — Any account of the writings of St. Jerome may well begin with his translation of the Holy Scriptures into Latin. It is at once the most important and the most meritorious of his works, a ripe fruit of the most painstaking studies. a) We have already said that about 383 he was charged by Pope Damasus with the formation of a serviceable and trustworthy Latin text of the Bible. What the Pope wanted was not a new translation, but a restoration of the so-called Itala to its original state, so far as that was possible; except for grave reasons Jerome was to make no changes or corrections. The Itala had long been the usual ecclesiastical text in Italy, but in the course of time had suffered much alteration. At first Jerome revised the text of the four Gospels, and then that of the other books of the New Testament. He added a revision of the Psalter based on the κοινὴ ἔκδοσις of the Septuagint; this latter task, however, as he tells us in his preface, was in great part done with haste and imperfectly: cursim, magna ex parte[1]. This revised text, by order of Pope Damasus, was henceforth used in the Roman liturgy[2]. In other churches the revised Psalter of Jerome was known as *Psalterium Romanum,* in contradistinction to the older text which was henceforth known as *Psalterium Vetus.* Until Pius V (1566—1572) this revised Psalter was used in all the Roman churches; it is still the text used at St. Peter's in the recitation of the canonical hours; fragments of this old Psalterium Romanum are still found in the Roman Missal and the Roman Breviary. The New Testament in the revision of St. Jerome was willingly received, not only at Rome and in Italy, but gradually throughout the whole West, and has, since that time, always remained in general use in the Latin Church. b) Jerome had scarcely reached the Holy Land when he found in the library of the Church of Cæsarea the Hexapla of Origen, not a copy but the original (§ 39, 3). Once settled at Bethlehem, he began the revision of the Latin text of the Old Testa-

[1] Praef. in Ps. [2] *Migne,* PL., xxix.

ment in accordance with the Hexaplar text, always keeping in view the original. He began with the Psalms, and emended the Itala text in exact conformity to the Hexaplar text of the Septuagint; he also made use in his manuscript of the critical signs (asterisci and obelisci) of Origen. This Psalter text was first received and widely used in Gaul, whence its name of *Psalterium Gallicanum*[1]; at a later date it was accepted throughout the West, with the above-mentioned exceptions; it is to-day in common use as a part of the Vulgate and the Breviary. In the same way Jerome also revised most of the other books of the Old Testament. The greater part of these revised texts unfortunately disappeared, fraude cuiusdam[2], before he could publish them; only his text of Job which he completed shortly after the revision of the Psalter[3] has reached us. c) He had scarcely finished this work of revision when he decided to translate from the original (hebraica veritas) the entire Old Testament, so far as it was then extant in Hebrew or in Aramaic. He translated first, certainly about 390, the four books of Kings, then the book of Job, afterwards the Prophets, and at the same time the Psalms. A tedious spell of illness interrupted his labors. He began again towards the end of 393, and translated the three Solomonic books, then (394 to 396) Esdras and Nehemias, Paralipomenon and Genesis, and by 405 the four other books of the Pentateuch, with Josue, Judges, Ruth, Esther, Tobias and Judith. The latter two books he translated from the Aramaic, while he took from the Greek the deutero-canonical parts of Daniel and Esther[4]. He did not translate, perhaps because he doubted their canonicity, the books of Baruch, First and Second Maccabees, Ecclesiasticus and Wisdom, nor did he make another translation of the New Testament. He translated the Gospel of the Hebrews into Greek and Latin (ca. 390; § 29, 2), but this double translation has perished. — The purpose of Jerome was to reproduce the original text, with fidelity and accuracy, but not with servility; he was desirous also of preserving the traditional language of the Itala, in so far as it was possible to do so without offending against the canons of literary taste. The best versions are those of the historical proto-canonical books; the least meritorious are those of Tobias done in one day and Judith done in one night, as he tells us in the prefaces to these works. At the same time it must be admitted that his version of the Solomonic books is an excellent one, although he states in his preface that it was done in a space of three days (tridui opus). It is true that he can be reproached with both inexact renderings and positive errors in all these books; nevertheless, among all the ancient Latin versions not one can even remotely compete with his, so conscientiously did he strive to fulfil

[1] *Migne*, PL., xxix. [2] Ep. 134, 2. [3] *Migne*, PL., xxix.
[4] Ib., xxviii—xxix.

the highest duty of a good translator. It was slowly, however, and very gradually, that his versions superseded the earlier ones in general ecclesiastical use. Since the seventh century they have been generally adopted throughout the Latin Church, and since the twelfth century they have inherited from the older translation the title of Vulgate. The text of the Psalterium Gallicanum was, however, so deeply rooted in popular use and affection that the new version of our Saint was powerless to supersede it. Also those deuterocanonical books which Jerome did not translate continued to be read in the Old-Itala text.

5. OTHER EXEGETIC LABORS. — They are partly translations from the Greek exhibiting a greater or lesser degree of recension, and partly independent works. a) To the first category belong translations of a series of homilies of Origen: 14 on Jeremias and 14 on Ezechiel (translated at Constantinople about 380)[1]; 2 on the Canticle of canticles, translated at Rome about 383[2], 39 on Luke, translated at Bethlehem about 389[3]; 9 on Isaias, probably also translated at Bethlehem[4]; Liber interpretationis hebraicorum nominum[5], written about 390, an attempt at an etymological interpretation of the proper names in the scriptural books (§ 39, 11); finally his: De situ et nominibus locorum hebraicorum liber[6], written also about 390, and much superior, as a scientific work, to the preceding composition; it was a revision of the biblical topography of Eusebius of Cæsarea, with many omissions, but also with some additions and corrections that are valuable because of the personal knowledge of the author. b) In 392 he drew up[7] a catalogue of his own exegetical writings. The order is probably chronological: Scripsi de Seraphim (a hasty treatise on Is. vi. usually found among the letters of Jerome)[8], de Osanna[9] et de frugi et luxurioso filiis[10]; de tribus quaestionibus legis veteris[11]; in epistolam Pauli ad Galatas commentariorum libros iii[12], item in epistolam ad Ephesios libros iii[13]; in epistolam ad Titum librum unum[14]; in epistolam ad Philemonem librum unum[15]; in Ecclesiasten commentarios[16]; quaestionum hebraicarum in Genesim librum unum[17], a series of difficult and important passages from the Old Itala version critically discussed in the light of the Hebrew text and the various Greek versions, in Psalmos x—xvi tractatus vii (a lost and otherwise unknown work) .; scripsi praeterea in Michaeam explanationum libros ii[18]; in Sophoniam librum unum[19]; in Nahum librum

[1] Ib , xxv. 583—786. [2] Ib., xxiii. 1117—1144.
[3] Ib., xxvi. 219—306. [4] Ib., xxiv. 901—936.
[5] Ib., xxiii. 771—858. [6] Ib., xxiii. 859—928.
[7] De viris ill., c. 135. [8] Ep. 18: *Migne,* PL., xxii. 361—376.
[9] Ep. 20: ib., xxii. 375—379. [10] Ep. 21: ib., xxii. 379—394.
[11] Ep. 36: ib., xxii. 452—461. [12] Ib., xxvi. 307—438.
[13] Ib., xxvi. 439—554. [14] Ib., xxvi. 555—600. [15] Ib., xxvi. 599—618.
[16] Ib., xxiii. 1009—1116. [17] Ib., xxiii. 935—1010.
[18] Ib., xxv. 1151—1230. [19] Ib., xxv. 1337—1388.

unum[1]; in Habacuc libros ii[2]; in Aggaeum librum unum[3], multaque alia de opere prophetali quae nunc habeo in manibus et necdum expleta sunt. At a later date, Jerome composed copious commentaries on the twelve minor and the four greater prophets[4]; only that on Jeremias remained unfinished. He omits in this catalogue an allegorical exposition of the prophet Abdias, composed by him about 370, and later (about 396)[5] judged by himself in the preface to Abdias to be a juvenile production, doubtless not meant for the public, and therefore allowed to perish. He also omits the *Commentarioli in Psalmos* which he later recognized as his own[6]; these brief scholia on all the Psalms, supplementary to Origen's Psalm-scholia, were long supposed to be lost, but were discovered lately owing to the industrious research and the good fortune of Dom Morin. Mention must also be made, not only of a number of exegetical letters and replies, but also of a commentary on the Gospel of St. Matthew[7] written in 398, and of another on the Apocalypse. The last work was supposed to have perished but was recognized, as it seems, by Haussleiter in the *Summa dicendorum,* prefixed by Beatus, an eighth-century abbot of Libana, to his commentary on the Apocalypse. This Summa dicendorum is, however, scarcely more than an extract from the commentary of the Donatist writer Tichonius (see no. 13) which had already been used by Jerome for his recension of the commentary of Victorinus of Pettau (§ 58, 1). Certain exegetical works attributed to Jerome are spurious: Breviarium in Psalmos[8]; Quaestiones hebraicae in libros Regum et in libros Paralip.[9]; Expositio interlinearis libri Job[10]; Commentarii in Evangelia[11]; Commentarii in epistolas S. Pauli[12], and others. — From the standpoint of philological and historico-archæological knowledge, as well as of the vast extent of his reading — in other words, from the standpoint of erudition —, these expository writings of St. Jerome are easily the first among all similar products of Western ecclesiastical literature. On the other hand, they are not, however, faultless: many of them are doubtless only hasty outlines, or were rapidly dictated to his scribes. When he was writing his commentary on Ephesians he was wont to turn out daily a thousand lines[13]; he dictated his commentary on St. Matthew in fourteen days[14]; he often dictated whatever thoughts were uppermost in his mind (dicto quodcumque in buccam venerit)[15]. Such haste, often the result of external causes,

[1] *Migne*, PL., xxv. 1231—1272. [2] Ib., xxv. 1273—1338.
[3] Ib., xxv. 1387—1416. [4] Ib., xxiv xxv.
[5] Comm. in Abd., praef. [6] Apol. adv. Ruf., i. 19.
[7] *Migne*, PL., xxvi. 15—218. [8] Ib., xxvi. 821—1270.
[9] Ib., xxiii. 1329—1402. [10] Ib., xxiii. 1407—1470.
[11] Ib., xxx. 531—644. [12] Ib., xxx. 645—902.
[13] Comm. in Ephes., lib. 2, praef. [14] Comm. in Matth., praef.
[15] Comm. in Gal., lib. 3, praef.; Comm. in Abd., etc.

is responsible for occasional shortcomings of St. Jerome as an exegete: imperfection of form, poverty of contents, waverings and contradictions, and in difficult places a mere repetition of the ideas of earlier exegetes, Christian and Jewish, whereby the reader is left to select and judge for himself. However, it is precisely this tendency to compilation that lends a special value to the expository works of St. Jerome. They are a real mine of important exegetical materials, and are occasionally very helpful in the study of the earlier history of ecclesiastical exegesis and doctrine. Valuable exegetical fragments of Origen, Apollinaris, Didymus and several other writers, otherwise little known or utterly lost, have survived in the pages of Jerome, mired up with Jewish traditions of exegesis that are often also very interesting and precious. Another defect of Jerome, possibly more blameworthy than the hurry of his work, is a lack of hermeneutical method, an uncertain and inconsistent attitude towards the fundamental principles of scriptural exegesis. In general, Jerome seems thoroughly convinced that it is necessary to fix and explain the historico-grammatical sense of Scripture. At the same time, he feels himself free to seek for a deeper mystic sense, or as he rhetorically puts it: super fundamenta historiae spirituale exstruere aedificium; historiae Hebraeorum tropologiam nostrorum miscere; spiritualis postea intelligentiae vela pandere[1]. Occasionally, his exposition is as capricious and unnatural as that of Origen, he adheres to the Alexandrine theory of a triple sense of Scripture, and agrees with Origen that the literal sense of the biblical narrative might be ridiculous or unworthy or even blasphemous, in which cases scandal could be avoided only by use of the allegorical method[2]. The controversy between Jerome and Augustine apropos of Gal. ii. 11 ff. is well-known. In his commentary on that Epistle, written in 387 or 388, Jerome had adopted an earlier idea of Origen, afterwards maintained by Chrysostom, viz., that the disagreement of the two Apostles was not real but feigned; they really thought alike concerning the binding force of the Law; St. Peter, however, so bore himself externally as to permit St. Paul publicly to correct him (in appearance, *κατὰ πρόσωπον*) and thus ensure general recognition of the truth. In a number of letters St. Augustine undertook to convince St. Jerome that such an exegesis would utterly destroy the authority of the Sacred Scriptures, by placing them in the attitude of apologists for deceit and trickery, and it seems that St. Jerome afterwards admitted[3] the correctness of the observations of Augustine.

6. HISTORICAL WORKS. — In his own days Jerome was known as an historian. Foremost in the catalogue of his writings, written

[1] Comm. in Is., lib. 6, praef.; Comm. in Zach., praef.; Ep. 64, 19.
[2] Ep. 21, 13; 52, 2.
[3] Dial. contra Pelag., i. 22.

in 392[1], is the *Vita Pauli monachi,* or life of St. Paul of Thebes[2] about 376, a real folk-narrative of the legend of this hermit which had long been current in popular oral tradition. About 391 he wrote two other lives of Saints: the short *Vita Malchi captivi monachi*[3] in which he narrates the life of a monk of the desert of Chalcis, taken down by himself from the lips of the narrator, and the *Vita beati Hilarionis*[4], the history of the first Palestinian hermit († 371), gathered from oral and written sources, and rightly entitled to be called a biography Jerome never executed the plan mentioned in the first chapter of the life of Malchus i. e. an ecclesiastical history from the Apostles to his own time, as exhibited in the lives of martyrs and other holy men and women. The so-called *Martyrologium Hieronymianum*[5] is a copious compilation from martyrological calendars belonging to various churches, brought to a close about 530 in Northern Italy, perhaps at Aquileia, but enriched with various additions at a still later date. The known manuscripts all belong to a Gallic archetype written in 627 or 628 at Luxeuil or Auxerre. We may also mention here certain necrologies, or, as he was wont to call them, *Epitaphia,* of his friends, thrown into epistolary form[6]. Mediæval scribes used these compositions as models precisely in the manner in which they used his *Vitae* for their own hagiographical writings. More important are two other historical works: one a version or rather an improved Latin recension and continuation of the chronological tables that formed the second half of the *Chronicon* of Eusebius[7], and the work *De viris illustribus*[8]. The former work was composed at Constantinople about 380, and the latter at Bethlehem in 392. In the first of these works, Jerome furnished the West with a chronological synopsis of universal history Though it would scarcely satisfy the exigencies of modern science, at that period it was a highly prized contribution and greatly furthered all kinds of historical labors. The latter part of the work is an addition to the text of Eusebius covering the years 326—379. Though only a collection of miscellaneous historical information with no insistence on the relative importance of the details, it was nevertheless destined to be the guide and model of mediæval chroniclers. We have already described (§ 2, 1) the *De viris illustribus* of our Saint.

7 DOGMATICO-POLEMICAL WRITINGS. — By calling and gifts, Jerome was rather an historian than a dogmatic writer. His doctrinal writings are all occasional. Most of them aim at repelling attacks on ecclesiastical tradition, and in all it is the polemical inter-

[1] De viris ill., c. 135. [2] *Migne,* PL., xxiii. 17—28.
[3] Ib., xxiii. 53—60. [4] Ib., xxiii. 29—54. [5] Ib., xxx. 435—486.
[6] Ep. 60, on Nepotian: Ib., xxii. 589—602; Ep. 108, on Paula: Ib., xxii. 878 to 906: Ep. 127, on Marcella: Ib., xxii. 1087—1095.
[7] Ib., xxvii; cf. § 62, 2. [8] Ib., xxiii. 601—720.

est that predominates. He made some translations from the Greek, but they have perished in part at least. Thus, of his translation of the four books of Origen περὶ ἀρχῶν (§ 39, 8), made about 399, only a few insignificant fragments have reached us[1]. On the other hand, his translation or recension of the work of Didymus the Blind (§ 70, 2) on the Holy Ghost has reached us; Jerome began it at Rome, and finished it at Bethlehem; it is, in its way. a very successful piece of literary composition[2]. The earliest known of his dogmatic writings is a dialogue against the schismatic faction of the Luciferians (§ 87, 2): Altercatio Luciferiani et orthodoxi[3], composed at Antioch, probably in 379. About 383 he wrote at Rome, in defence of the perpetual virginity of Mary, his: Liber adv. Helvidium de perpetua virginitate b. Mariae[4], a work inspired by virtuous indignation and remarkable for robust vigor of diction. Closely related, in its first part at least, is the work *Adversus Jovinianum*[5], probably written in 392. In the first book of this work he extols, not without exaggeration, the dignity and merit of virginity as compared with the married state; in the second book he attacks the teaching of Jovinian that baptized persons could not sin, that fasting was of no avail, and that the reward of all true Christians would be an absolutely equal one. The works: Contra Ioannem Hierosolymitanum[6], written in 398 or 399, the: Apologiae adv. libros Rufini libri ii[7], written in 402, and the: Liber tertius s. ultima responsio adv. scripta Rufini[8], written shortly after the preceding work, are a sad result of the Origenistic controversies, and betray a high degree of personal irritation. In the little work *Contra Vigilantium*[9], written in 406 in one night, he breaks a lance for the ecclesiastical cultus of the martyrs and the Saints, the voluntary poverty of monks, and the celibacy of the clergy. Finally, towards the end of 415, he appeared as the defender of the ecclesiastical doctrine of grace, against the teaching of Pelagius. The three books of this: Dialogus contra Pelagianos[10], are famous for their literary perfection.

8. LETTERS AND HOMILIES. — From the beginning of the mediæval times the letters of Jerome have been accounted the most charming of his writings. Indeed, both as to contents and style, they are attractive and fascinating compositions. Jerome found a letter the most suitable channel for the development of his thoughts; he delights in throwing an entire treatise into epistolary form. He tells us himself that he was for a long time accustomed to write every day a number of letters of the ordinary kind. In the catalogue of his

[1] Ep. 124 ad Avitum, quid cavendum in libris περὶ ἀρχῶν: Ib., xxii. 1059—1072.
[2] Ib., xxiii. 101—154. [3] Ib., xxiii. 155—182. [4] Ib., xxiii. 183—206.
[5] Ib., xxiii. 211—338. [6] Ib., xxiii. 355—396.
[7] Ib., xxiii. 397—456. [8] Ib., xxiii. 457—492.
[9] Ib., xxiii. 339—352. [10] Ib., xxiii. 495—590.

works[1] drawn up in 392 he mentions some letters that for one reason or another appeared important to him: Ad Heliodorum exhortatoriam (epistolam), De Seraphim, and others. He also mentions two collections of his letters: Epistolarum ad diversos librum unum, Ad Marcellam epistolarum librum unum, and adds: Epistolarum autem ad Paulam et Eustochium, quia quotidie scribuntur, incertus est numerus. We possess at present about one hundred and twenty letters of Jerome. They cover a period of a half century and are a mirror of his varied life, being directed to persons of all sorts and conditions and dealing with widely divergent matters; they are also an accurate mirror of manners and events of Roman life in that period. It is worthy of note that while many of our Saint's writings betray a hurried composition amid distracting occupations, several of his letters were evidently written with great care; some of them, especially those of his youthful period, were no doubt written for effect. It is in his letters that he exhibits most fully his many literary gifts: his sense of beauty and elegance, his originality and vigor of expression, in a word his skill in bold and warm coloring. We have already mentioned (see no. 5 and 6) two special groups of his letters: exegetical and necrological in contents. We may refer here briefly to a series of letters that recommend the ascetic life, or aim at the guidance of those who have adopted it. Many of them were originally intended for a wider circle of readers than was represented by their immediate recipients. In this circle of similarly minded contemporaries they met not only with approval but with admiration, and have ever since been looked on as most precious gems of works in the literature of ecclesiastical piety. Among them are the Ep. 14[2] in which he beseeches his intimate friend Heliodorus to go back to the desert of Chalcis that he had abandoned, Ep. 22[3] in which he exhorts Eustochium to remain loyal and courageous in her pursuit of the ideals of a virginal spouse of God; Ep. 52[4] in which he replies to the request of the young priest Nepotian, and instructs him in the way of acquiring and preserving that sanctity of life which became his state. We may add those letters in which after the death of Paula (Jan. 26., 404) he translated the monastic rule of St. Pachomius and some letters of Pachomius and Theodorus[5]. — It was again the good fortune of Dom Morin to discover certain homilies of St. Jerome, and to silence all opposition to their genuineness. He published in 1897 fifty-nine homilies on the Psalms, ten on the Gospel of St. Mark, and ten on other subjects, the preface to his edition of these homilies describes the discovery of another hitherto unknown series of homilies on the Psalms. The newly published homilies are

[1] De viris ill., c. 135. [2] *Migne*, PL., xxii. 347—355.
[3] Ib., xxii. 394—425. [4] Ib., xxii. 527—540.
[5] Ib., xxiii. 61—100; cf. § 64, 2 3.

not finished works destined for publicity, but improvised discourses, probably sermons of the year 401, either delivered on Sundays or on week days in presence of his monks, and taken down by his hearers. This serves to modify a certain disappointment caused by the reading of these homilies; some of them, however, contain passages of great oratorical perfection.

9. JEROME AS A SCHOLAR. — He is one of those Fathers honored by the Church with the title of Doctor, and in so far as this title stands, among other things, for a recognition of rare erudition, there is scarcely one among the Fathers to whom it is given with more justice. During his own life-time he was hailed as the greatest polyhistor of the age. Orosius assures us[1] that the entire West thirsts for the words of the priest of Bethlehem as the dry fleece thirsts for the dew of heaven; John Cassian tells us[2] that his writings shine in the Christian world like the stars of the firmament. Sulpicius Severus says[3] that there is no other writer so well-versed in Greek, Latin, and Hebrew learning; he has no rival in any branch of knowledge: ut se illi in omni scientia nemo audeat comparare. Augustine is witness[4] that Jerome had read all or nearly all (omnes vel paene omnes) previous theological writers of the East and West. While he was deservedly recognized as among the first in every branch of theology, he was held by all to be pre-eminent in the biblical sciences. They were his especial delight, and in this department he produced his greatest works. Even to-day, he deserves our sincere admiration as a capable exegete, or rather a skilful philologist, a trained critic, and a translator of genius. No other Latin writer of his time was so well acquainted with Greek, and he stands alone among his contemporaries in his knowledge of the Old Testament languages. It is not hard to pick flaws in his knowledge of Hebrew, since he esteemed too highly the Jewish or Rabbinical traditions of his time, but it is also unjust to apply our modern criteria to the conditions of his day. A simply irresistible proof of his skill and readiness in the use of Hebrew is found in his own narrative of the translation of the book of Tobias from Aramaic into Latin in the year 405: «Since Chaldaic (Aramaic) is close akin to the Hebrew, I sought out a scholar who knew both languages well (no doubt a Jewish rabbi), and with severe labor I dictated in Latin during *one day* to a hired tachygrapher what that scholar had dictated to me in Hebrew»[5]. Nor was he entirely unacquainted with Aramaic. Several years earlier when occupied with the translation of Daniel (ca. 391), he had devoted much time to the study of Aramaic; he was able to describe[6] the result of his hard labor in the following

[1] Liber apol. contra Pelag., c. 4. [2] De incarnatione, vii. 26.
[3] Dial. i. 8. [4] Contra Iulianum, i. 7, 34.
[5] Praef. in lib. Tob. [6] Praef. in lib. Dan.

words: «Even to this day I can read and understand Chaldaic better than I can pronounce it.» In a word, the philological attainments of St. Jerome were such as to indicate him, and him alone among all the Christian savants of his time, as the one man prepared for and called to a task at once so important and so difficult as a translation of the Holy Scriptures.

10. JEROME AS WITNESS TO THE FAITH OF THE CHURCH. — He is not only a miracle of learning, but also a pillar of the true faith. Cassian had already called him[1] «a man of most extensive knowledge and of thoroughly approved and pure doctrine». Sulpicius Severus says[2]: «The heretics hate him because he ceases not from attacking them, and ecclesiastics hate him because he is inimical to their way of life and their vices (see no. 2). But all good men admire and love him, for those who call him a heretic, are bereft of reason (insani sunt). I speak the truth when I say: the thoughts of this man are Catholic, his teaching is sound.» Severus hints that Jerome was not spared from charges of heresy; he has in mind, perhaps, the accusation of Origenism made against him by Rufinus. There is no reason to suspect the judgment of Cassian because of his own leaning towards Semipelagianism. The occasional expressions of St. Jerome on the priority of grace or on free-will are in some details inexact; but in his commentary on Jeremias, composed during the Pelagian controversy and one of his maturest writings, he often presupposes, apparently at least, the necessity of *gratia praeveniens;* thus, on Jer. xviii. 1 ff.: Ita libertas arbitrii reservanda est, ut in omnibus excellat gratia largitoris; at xxiv. 1 ff.: Non solum opera, sed et voluntas nostra Dei nititur auxilio; at xxxi. 18—19: Hoc ipsum quod agimus poenitentiam, nisi nos Dominus ante converterit, nequaquam implere valemus, and this remark throws light on what he says at iii. 21—22: Quamvis enim propria voluntate ad Dominum revertamur, tamen nisi ille nos traxerit et cupiditatem nostram suo roboraverit praesidio, salvi esse non poterimus. The Pelagian Julianus admitted[3] that the «Dialogue against the Pelagians» was written «with marvellous elegance»: *mira venustate,* and the chronicler Hydatius[4] accounts it a special merit of the author that at the end of his life «he broke in pieces the sect of the Pelagians together with its author, by means of the steel hammer of truth» It is true, of course, that the theological contents of the polemic of Jerome are far inferior to those of the anti-Pelagian writings of Augustine, as in general the bishop of Hippo is far superior to the priest of Bethlehem in depth and solidity and independence of thought; the gift of speculation in Jerome is by no means as prominent as his vast erudition. Hence, he has not influenced the development of theology in the

[1] De incarnatione, vii. 26. [2] Dial. i. 9, 4 5.
[3] *Aug.,* Opus imperfectum contra Iulianum, iv. 88. [4] Chron. ad a 415.

same measure as St. Augustine. Among the testimonia to the doctrine of the Church that are scattered through his works, his defence of the Catholic rule of faith has always been praised. The doctrinal authority of the Church as a proximate source of Christian faith, especially the magisterium of the successor of St. Peter, had no more energetic defenders among the Christians of antiquity About 378 he wrote from the desert of Chalcis to Pope Damasus: «While the sons of iniquity have consumed their inheritance, it is only among you (apud vos solos) that the inheritance of the Fathers has been preserved intact while I follow in the first place only Christ I keep in communion with your Holiness i. e. with the see of Peter. I know that upon this rock the Church is established Therefore decide, I implore and conjure you, and we shall unhesitatingly confess three hypostases. If you will so order, let a Creed be drawn up in place of the Nicene, and we of the true faith shall confess it in terms similar to those of the Arians[1].» Also in other and later letters he emphasizes again and again the fact that the faith of the Roman Church, long since praised by St. Paul, must always be held as the supreme rule and decisive standard of Christian faith[2]. — In his commentaries he insists that Scripture must be understood in the sense of the Church. The sense which the Church teaches is the sense intended by the Holy Ghost, the author of Scripture. Whoever interprets Scripture against the sense of the Church or the intention of the Holy Ghost, is a heretic; interpreted in such a way, the Gospel of Christ becomes a gospel of man or rather of Satan[3]. Outside the Church there is no salvation. «Whoever eats the Lamb outside that house, is unholy (profanus). Whoever is not in the Ark of Noah, will perish in the flood»[4]. «Whoever is saved, is saved in the Church»[5]. «Whoever is outside the Church of the Lord, cannot be pure»[6]. It is owing to this conviction that the entire life of Jerome was consumed in endless conflicts with the enemies of the Church. «I have never spared heretics», he wrote not long before his death, «but have always held with great zeal that the enemies of the Church were also my enemies»[7]

II. JEROME AS MASTER OF CHRISTIAN PROSE. — In order not to omit all reference to the literary character of the writings of Jerome, it may be said that, with the exception of Lactantius, no Christian prose-writer of antiquity laid so much stress on formal elegance as our Saint; and no Christian writer, with the exception of Tertullian, stamped so strongly upon his writings his own very original personality None of the Christian Latin writers has exercised, even

[1] Ep. 15, 1 2 4; cf. 16, 2. [2] Ep. 46, 11; 63, 2; 130, 16.
[3] Comm. in Gal., i. 11—12; v. 19—21; in Mich., i. 10 ff.; in Ier., xxix. 8—9.
[4] Ep. 15, 2. [5] In Ioel, iii. 1 ff. [6] In Ezech., vii. 19.
[7] Dial. contra Pelag., praef.

approximately, so marked an influence on the ecclesiastical Latinity of a later period; in this respect his translation of the Bible and many of his letters were authoritative. He has been rightly called the master of Christian prose for all later centuries. In his style and diction, it is the rhetorician that stands out most prominently, but a rhetorician highly gifted by nature and thoroughly trained in good schools. It must be admitted that his rhetorical culture is not all made up of excellencies; his earlier writings especially betray a love of florid language, a tendency to hyperbole and to the declamatory and sensational.

12. COMPLETE EDITIONS. TRANSLATIONS. — The first complete edition of St. Jerome was brought out by *D. Erasmus,* Basel, 1516—1520, 9 vols. Other editions were brought out by *Marianus Victorius,* bishop of Rieti, Rome, 1565—1572, 9 vols.; by the Benedictines *J. Martianay* and *A. Pouget,* Paris, 1693—1706, 5 vols.; *D. Vallarsi,* Verona, 1734—1742, 11 vols., and Venice, 1766—1772, 11 vols. (reprinted in *Migne,* PL., xxii—xxx). *A. Reifferscheid* (Bibl. Patr. lat. Ital., i. 66; cf. ib., pp. 90 278) says of the Vallarsi edition: «Although the revision of the Benedictine edition by Vallarsi and his confrères has often been praised, the text of St. Jerome still remains a neglected text, and the manuscript tradition is but imperfectly known.» — Some writings of St. Jerome were translated into Greek by his friend Sophronius (De viris ill., c. 134). Selections from his writings were translated into German by *P. Leipelt,* Kempten, 1872—1874, 2 vols. (Bibl. der Kirchenväter). *B. Matougues,* Œuvres de St. Jérôme, Paris, 1858 (xxxii and 683 pp.), offers a French translation of copious excerpts, and even whole works. A still larger selection is found in the English translation of *W. H. Fremantle,* in Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church, series II, vol. vi, New York, 1893.

13. EDITIONS, VERSIONS, AND RECENSIONS OF SEPARATE WORKS. — *Translations of the Scripture:* A critical edition of St. Jerome's revision of the New Testament was undertaken by *Wordsworth* and *White:* Novum Testamentum D. N. Iesu Christi latine secundum editionem S. Hieronymi. Ad codicum mss. fidem rec. *J. Wordsworth* et *H. J. White,* part I, Quattuor Evangelia, Oxford, 1889—1898. For the Hieronymian version of the Greek text of Job cf. *P. de Lagarde,* Mitteilungen, Göttingen, 1887, ii. 189—237, and *C. P. Caspari,* Das Buch Hiob (i. 1 to xxxviii. 16) in Hieronymus' Übersetzung aus der alexandrinischen Version nach einer St. Gallener Handschrift saec. viii, Christiania, 1893. The best edition of S. Jerome's version of the Psalms, not in ecclesiastical use as described above, is that of *Lagarde,* Psalterium iuxta Hebraeos Hieronymi e recognitione *Pauli de Lagarde,* Leipzig, 1874. Cf. *de Lagarde,* Probe einer neuen Ausgabe der lateinischen Übersetzungen des Alten Testaments, Göttingen, 1885 (contains Psalms i—xvii, according to twenty-six text-witnesses. For other works on the Hieronymian versions of the Bible and the actual Vulgate the reader is referred to the current manuals of Introduction to Biblical Studies; cf. *P. Corssen,* in Jahresbericht über die Fortschritte der klass. Altertumswissenschaft (1899), ci. i—83: «Bericht über die lateinischen Bibelübersetzungen». — *Other exegetical labors:* Onomastica sacra. *P. de Lagarde* (ed. Gott., 1870) alterum ed., Gött., 1887, pp. 25—116: Hieronymi liber interpretationis hebraicorum nominum; pp. 117—190: Hieronymi de situ et nominibus locorum hebraicorum liber. Concerning the last work see *M. Spanier,* Exegetische Beiträge zu Hieronymus' Onomastikon, Magde-

burg, 1896; *Id.,* Nachträge und Berichtigungen (to the previous essay), ib., 1898. *E. Klostermann,* Eusebius' Schrift περὶ τῶν τοπικῶν ὀνομάτων, pp. 16—21, in Texte und Untersuchungen, new series, viii. 2 b. Hieronymi Quaestiones hebraicae in libro Geneseos e recognitione *Pauli de Lagarde,* Leipzig, 1868. S. Hieronymi presb. qui deperditi hactenus putabantur commentarioli in Psalmos, ed. *G. Morin,* Maredsous, 1895 (Anecdota Maredsolana, iii. 1). S. Hieronymi Stridonensis presbyteri tractatus contra Origenem de visione Isaiae (vi. 1 f.), quem nunc primum ex codd. mss. Casinensibus *A. M. Amelli* in lucem edidit et illustravit, Montecassino, 1901; *Id.,* in Studi Religiosi (1901), i. 193—204. The authorship of Jerome, but at a later date, is defended by *G. Morin,* in Revue d'hist. ecclés. (1901), ii. 810—827, against *G. Mercati,* in Revue Biblique (1901), x. 385—392; cf. the reply of *Morin,* ib. (1897), iii. 164—173. See also *J. Lataix,* Le commentaire de St. Jérôme sur Daniel, in Revue d'hist. et de littér. religieuses (1897), ii. 164—173 268—277. *G. Morin,* Sancti Hieronymi presbyteri tractatus sive homiliae in Psalmos quatuordecim (Anecdota Maredsolana, 1903, iii. 3). — The commentary on the Apocalypse of the Donatist Tichonius, foundation and source of the commentary of Jerome, has perished, but it might be reconstructed in large measure from the works of later commentators on whom Tichonius exercised a great influence, particularly from the commentary of Beatus of Libana, composed about 776. See *Haussleiter,* § 58, 1, and the important remarks of *F. Ramsay,* Le commentaire de l'Apocalypse par Beatus de Libana, in Revue d'histoire et de littérature religieuses (1902), vii. 419—447. For other works of Tichonius see *Gennad.,* De viris ill., c. 18. There is still extant Tichonii Afri liber de septem regulis (*Migne,* PL., xviii. 15—66); it contains seven rules for the explanation of passages in the Scripture made difficult by the figurative speech of the sacred writer. These rules might have perished, had they not been incorporated by St. Augustine into his work De doctrina christiana, iii. 30—37 *Migne,* xxxiv. 81—90. For a critical edition see *F C. Burkitt,* Cambridge, 1894, in Texts and Studies, iii. 1. *T Hahn,* Tyconius-Studien, Leipzig, 1900, in Studien zur Gesch. der Theol. und der Kirche, vi. 2. *A. B. Sharpe,* Tychonius and St. Augustin, in Dublin Review (1903), pp. 64—72. *G. Morin* published, in Rev. Bénéd. (1903), xx. 225—236, a little work entitled De monogrammate (Apoc. xiii. 18), in some way connected with the treatment of the commentary on the Apocalypse of Victorinus of Pettau by St. Jerome (§ 58, 1). As to the author of the pseudo-Hieronymian Quaestiones Hebraicae in libros Regum et in libros Paralipomenon (Ib., xxiii. 1329—1402) cf. *S. Berger,* Quam notitiam linguae hebraicae habuerint christiani medii aevi temporibus in Gallia (Thèse), Nancy, 1893, pp. 1—4. It seems that the pseudo-Hieronymian Expositio interlinearis libri Job (Ib., xxiii. 1407—1470) was composed by the priest Philippus, an optimus auditor Hieronymi (*Gennad.,* De viris ill., c. 62), and later worked over and enlarged by Venerable Bede; cf. *O. Zöckler,* Hieronymus, Gotha, 1865, p. 471. For the spurious Commentarii in epistolas S. Pauli (Ib., xxx. 645—902) cf. § 94, 16. The exegetical labors of St. Jerome are discussed by *M. Rahmer,* Die hebräischen Traditionen in den Werken des Hieronymus, durch eine Vergleichung mit den jüdischen Quellen kritisch beleuchtet, i: Die «Quaestiones in Genesin», Breslau, 1861. The second part of this work, on the «commentaries», did not get beyond those to Osee and Joel, and appeared in Monatschrift f. Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums 1865 1867 1868 1898. Since then *M. Rahmer* has again taken up his labors: Die hebr. Traditionen, etc. Die commentarii zu den 12 kleinen Propheten, first and second half, in two fascicules, Berlin, 1902. *C. Siegfried,* Die Aussprache des Hebräischen bei Hiero-

nymus, in Zeitschr. für die alttestamentl. Wissensch. (1884), iv. 34—83. *W. Nowack,* Die Bedeutung des Hieronymus für die alttestamentl. Textkritik, Göttingen, 1875. *W. Bacher,* Eine angebliche Lücke im hebr. Wissen des Hieronymus, in Zeitschr. f. die alttestamentl. Wissensch. (1902), pp. 114—116. *J. A. Möhlers* Gesammelte Schriften und Aufsätze, herausgegeben von *J. J. J. Döllinger* (Ratisbon, 1839—1840), i. 1—18: Hieronymus und Augustinus im Streit über Gal. ii. 14. Cf. *Fr. Overbeck,* Über die Auffassung des Streites des Paulus mit Petrus in Antiochien (Gal. ii. 11 ff.) bei den Kirchenvätern (Progr.), Basel, 1877. *A. Röhrich,* Essai sur St. Jérôme exégète (Thèse), Geneva, 1891. *L. Sanders,* Etudes sur St. Jérôme, sa doctrine touchant l'inspiration des livres saints et leur véracité, l'autorité des deutérocanoniques, la distinction entre l'épiscopat et le presbytérat, l'origénisme, Paris, 1903. *G. Hoberg,* De sancti Hieronymi ratione interpretandi, Freiburg i. Br., 1903. *J. van den Gheyn,* Saint Jérôme, in Dictionnaire de la Bible, Paris, 1903, iii. 1305—1316.

14. EDITIONS AND RECENSIONS OF SEPARATE WORKS (CONTINUED). — *Historical works:* Eusebi Chronicorum libri duo, ed. *A. Schoene,* Berlin, 1866—1875, vol. ii: Hieronymi versionem e libris manuscriptis recensuit *A. Schoene.* Cf. § 62, 7. Hieronymi chronicorum codicis Floriacensis fragmenta Leidensia, Parisina, Vaticana phototypice edita. Praefatus est *L. Traube,* Leyden, 1902. *A. Schoene,* Die Weltchronik des Eusebius in ihrer Bearbeitung durch Hieronymus, Berlin, 1900. For De viris ill. see § 2, 1. *J. H. Reinkens,* Die Einsiedler des hl. Hieronymus in freier Bearbeitung dargestellt, Schaffhausen, 1864 (a re-arrangement of the lives of Paul, Hilarion and Malchus, also the necrologies of Marcella, Paula, and Fabiola. The Vita Pauli monachi is the source of all other accounts of Paul of Thebes; cf. *J. Bidez* in the introduction to his edition of two Greek lives of St. Paul, Ghent, 1900. *F Nau,* Le texte grec original de la vie de St. Paul de Thèbes, in Analecta Bolland. (1901), xx. 121—157; against his views *A. M. Kugener,* S. Jérôme et la vie de Paul de Thèbes, in Byzant. Zeitschr. (1902), xi. 513—517. For the Vita Beati Hilarionis, see *O. Zöckler,* in Neue Jahrb. f. deutsche Theol. (1894), iii. 146—178. Cf. also § 66, 5. For the Vita Malchi see *P. van den Ven,* St. Jérôme et la vie du moine Malchus le Captif, Louvain, 1901. — Martyrologium Hieronymianum ad fidem codicum adiectis prolegomenis ediderunt *J. B. de Rossi* et *L. Duchesne* (Acta SS. Nov. ii), Paris, 1894. Concerning this martyrology cf. *H. Achelis,* Die Martyrologien, Berlin, 1900, pp. 71 ff. *H. Grisar,* in Analecta Romana, Rome, 1899, i. 243—258, and *J. Chapman,* in Revue Bénédictine (1903), xx. 285—291. — *Dogmatico-polemical works:* For the date of composition of Altercatio Luciferiani et orthodoxi see *G. Grützmacher,* in Zeitschr. f. Kirchengesch. (1901), xxi. 1—8 (written «about 382»). The Adversus Helvidium is also in *H. Hurter,* SS. Patr. opusc. sel., ser. I, p. xii. A minute analysis of this work, with a sensible appreciation of its merit, is given by *F. A. v. Lehner,* Die Marienverehrung in den ersten Jahrhunderten, 2. ed., pp. 104—112. *W. Haller,* Jovinianus, die Fragmente seiner Schriften, die Quellen zu seiner Geschichte, sein Leben und seine Lehre, Leipzig, 1897, in Texte und Untersuchungen, xvii, new series, ii. 2. *E. Gaebel,* Jovinianus und seine Ansicht vom Verhältnis der Wiedergeborenen zur Sünde (Progr.), Posen, 1901. *W. Schmidt,* Vigilantius, Münster, 1860. *G. Nijhoff,* Vigilantius (Diss. inaug.), Gröningen, 1897. *H. Reville,* Vigilance de Calagurris. Un chapître de l'histoire de l'ascétisme monastique, Paris, 1902. The pseudo-Hieronymian Indiculus de haeresibus was last edited by *Fr. Oehler* (Corpus haereseologicum, Berlin, 1856, i. 281—300; cf. xii—xiv). — *Letters and homilies:* For Ep. 33 ad Paulam see § 39, 2. The Ep. 46 (according the title: Paulae

et Eustochii ep.), ad Marcellam, de sanctis locis, also in Itinera Hierosolymitana et descriptiones Terrae Sanctae, edd. *T. Tobler* et *A. Molinier*, Geneva, 1879, i. 41—47; the Peregrinatio S. Paulae auctore S. Hieronymo (Ib., pp. 27—40) is taken from Ep. 108, ad Eustochium (epitaphium Paulae matris). *C. Paucker* considers genuine, in Zeitschr. f. d. österreich. Gymnasien (1880), xxxi. 891—895, the two letters Ad amicum aegrotum, rejected as spurious by former editors (*Migne*, PL., xxx. 61—104). The genuineness of the Ep. ad Praesidium de cereo paschali (Ib.. xxx. 182—188) is defended by *Dom Morin*, in Revue Bénédictine (1891), viii. 20—27; (1892), ix. 392—397. For the spurious letter or treatise De septem ordinibus ecclesiae (Ib., xxx. 148—162) see § 111, 3. — S. Hieronymi epistolae selectae, in *Hurter*, SS. Patr. opusc. sel. (series I), xi. *S. D'Amico*, Girolamo di Stridone e le sue epistole, studio letterario, Acireale, 1902. S. Hieronymi presb. tractatus sive homiliae in Psalmos, in Marci Evangelium aliaque varia argumenta, ed. *G. Morin*, Maredsous, 1897, in Anecdota Maredsolana, iii. 2; cf. *Morin*, in Revue d'histoire et de littér. relig. (1896), i. 393—434; *Id.*, Quatorze nouveaux discours inédits de St. Jérôme, in Revue Bénéd. (1902), xix. 113—144.

15. WORKS ON SAINT JEROME. — *F. Z. Collombet*, Histoire de St. Jérôme, père de l'église au IV^e^ siècle; sa vie, ses écrits et ses doctrines, Paris et Lyons, 1844, 2 vols. This work was translated into German by *Fr. Lauchert* and *A. Knoll*, Rottweil, 1846—1848, 2 vols. *O. Zöckler*, Hieronymus. Sein Leben und Wirken aus seinen Schriften dargestellt, Gotha, 1865. *A. Thierry*, St. Jérôme, la société chrétienne à Rome et l'émigration romaine en Terre-Sainte, Paris, 1867, 2 vols., 2. ed., 1875, 3. ed., 1876. *C. Martin*, Life of Saint Jerome, London, 1888. *Largent*, Saint Jérôme, Paris, 1898 (Les Saints). *G. Grützmacher*, Hieronymus. Eine biographische Studie zur alten Kirchengeschichte. I. Sein Leben und seine Schriften bis zum Jahre 385, Leipzig, 1901, in Studien zur Geschichte der Theol. und der Kirche, vi. 3. *L. Sanders*, Etudes sur Saint Jérôme, Paris, 1903. — Divum Hieronymum oppido Stridonis in regione interamna (Muraköz) Hungariae anno 331 p. Chr. natum esse propugnat *J. Dankó*, Mainz, 1874. For the site of Stridon cf. *F. Bulič*, in Festschrift f. *O. Benndorf*, Vienna, 1898, pp. 276 to 280. Hieronymus quos noverit scriptores et ex quibus hauserit, scripsit *Aem. Luebeck*, Leipzig, 1872 (by scriptores *Luebeck* means the classical writers, Greek and Latin). *C. Paucker*, De latinitate beati Hieronymi observationes ad nominum verborumque usum pertinentes, Berlin, 1870; editio adiecto indice auctior, 1880. *H. Goelzer*, Etude lexicographique et grammaticale de la latinité de St. Jérôme (Thèse), Paris, 1844 (xii and 472 pp.). *B. Labanca*, Le Idee pedagogiche di S. Girolamo, Milan, 1901. *Asenstorfer*, War der hl. Hieronymus Kardinal? in Theol. prakt. Quartalschrift (1904), pp. 976—977.

## § 94. St. Augustine.

1. HIS PRE-BAPTISMAL LIFE (354—387). — Aurelius Augustinus was born November 13., 354, at Tagaste, an insignificant town of Numidia. His father, Patricius, one of the respectable men of the town, was a heathen and became a Christian only a short while before his death (371). But his mother, Monica, came from a Christian family, and was herself a model of Christian virtue. In the first nine books of his Confessions, Augustine himself has described (about the year 400) his intellectual and moral development from

his earliest childhood to the death of his mother (387). The extraordinary capacity of the boy was seen already in the school of Tagaste. His father intended him for the career of a rhetorician, and with this view made great sacrifices to keep him in the schools, first at the neighboring Madaura and afterwards (371) at the university of Carthage. He was an ardent youth and very susceptible to the impressions of the senses; consequently, he fell into a loose manner of living. Of his union with a concubine was born his son Adeodatus (372). At the age of nineteen, Augustine was deeply moved by reading the *Hortensius* of Cicero, and felt himself seized with a burning love for the immortal beauty of wisdom (373). His grateful admiration for the work of Cicero was troubled by one consideration: quod nomen Christi non erat ibi[1] With his mother's milk he had imbibed the consciousness that the name of Christ was synonymous with true wisdom. In the meantime he began to read the Holy Scriptures, but they failed to please him; he was discontented with their style and diction; as yet he was unable to appreciate their contents[2]. In 374, he joined the sect of the Manichæans, attracted by their assertion that, while Catholicism proposes to humiliate reason by making it subject to faith, Manichæism, on the contrary, leads men first to the study and the knowledge of truth: nos superstitione terreri et fidem nobis ante rationem imperari se autem nullum premere ad fidem nisi prius discussa et enodata veritate[3] Monica wept for the error of her son «more bitterly than mothers weep for the corporal death of their children»[4]. A bishop consoled her with the words: fieri non potest ut filius istarum lacrymarum pereat[5]. After finishing his studies at Carthage, Augustine began in his native town of Tagaste his career as a teacher of rhetoric. In the same year, apparently, he went up to Carthage, where greater opportunities awaited him. His abilities as a teacher of rhetoric were recognized on all sides, and his ambition was gratified in several ways. The proconsul Vindicianus publicly adjudged him the prize of poetry, and honored him thenceforth with his friendship. Gradually he ceased to be convinced of the truth of Manichæism. The study of astrology was the cause of grave doubts; and on the other hand, he was shocked by the immorality of the so-called *electi* among the Manichæans. It was only in 383 that he could gratify his long-cherished desire to meet Faustus of Milevi, the bishop of the Manichæans, who was looked on by his followers as an oracle of wisdom. But Faustus was not only unable to remove the doubts of Augustine, he betrayed himself a charlatan ignorant of the liberal arts and especially ignorant of astrology. The spell was broken; internally at least Augustine was no longer a Manichæan. Soon after this event he left Africa and

[1] Conf., iii. 4, 8. [2] Ib., iii. 5, 9. [3] De utilit. credendi, 1. 2.
[4] Conf., iii. 11, 19. [5] Ib., iii. 12, 21.

journeyed to Italy. After a few months spent at Rome, he obtained, through the good offices of the city-prefect Symmachus, a chair of rhetoric in the city of Milan. The personality of its bishop, Ambrose, made a profound impression on him, and, to the discourses of the bishop he owed it that henceforth many of his prejudices against Catholic doctrine began to disappear (§ 90, 1). He determined to enrol himself among the catechumens: statui ergo tamdiu esse catechumenus in Catholica ecclesia mihi a parentibus commendata, donec aliquid certi eluceret quo cursum dirigerem[1]. Certain Neoplatonist treatises, translated into Latin by Marius Victorinus (§ 87, 8), contributed to diminish the power of his evil passions, and to direct his thoughts to higher ideals. The splendor of divine truth began already to shine for him from the pages of St. Paul, but although the dawn had broken along the summit of his intelligence, a long and painful conflict was going on in the depths of his heart between the law of the spirit and the law of the flesh. One day (August, 386), while deeply troubled in spirit, he heard a mysterious voice: Tolle, lege; tolle, lege[2]. He took up the Epistles of St. Paul, and his eye rested on Romans xiii. 13—14: non in comessationibus et ebrietatibus. At once the dart of divine love entered his heart[3]; the bonds of human love were broken; all doubts ceased, and he was filled with calm and peace. He gave up his teaching, and in the autumn of 386 retired with his mother (who had followed him across the sea), his son Adeodatus and some other friends, to an estate called Cassiciacum near Milan. Here he made ready for the reception of baptism. He was baptized by Ambrose at Milan, during the night of April 24.—25., 387, together with his son Adeodatus and his friend Alypius. A few months later, he bade adieu to Milan and set out for Africa. Midway, at Ostia, his mother closed her mortal career. As late as the year 400 the memory of her death still plunged him into bitter-sweet sorrow, and drew from him touching accents of praise and gratitude; had not the dear departed mother begotten him both for earth and for heaven? «Me parturivit et carne, ut in hanc temporalem, et corde, ut in aeternam lucem renascerer[4].

2. HIS LIFE AFTER BAPTISM (387—430). — His mother's death caused a delay in his return to Africa. He spent nearly a year at Rome in learned studies, and landed at Carthage only in the autumn of 388. For the story of the remaining years of his life we are indebted to his friend and disciple, Possidius, bishop of Calama, who wrote about 432 a *Vita Sancti Augustini* that begins where the Confessions leave off[5]. Some friends and disciples accompanied Augustine to Tagaste where he took up his residence on a small estate he had inherited. Here, for about three years (ferme triennio)[6],

[1] Ib., v. 14, 25. [2] Ib., viii. 12, 29. [3] Ib., ix. 2, 3. [4] Ib., ix. 8, 17.
[5] *Migne*, PL., xxxii. 33—66. [6] *Possid.*, Vita Augustini, c. 3.

he led a life of ideal retirement, dividing his time between the care of his little monastic community, religious meditation, and literary labors. During this period Adeodatus died. Early in 391, Augustine made a journey to Hippo Regius, an important city on the Numidian coast. It was an eventful journey, for he was destined never to enjoy again his rustic solitude. The fame of his piety and learning had already spread far and wide. When Valerius, the aged bishop of Hippo, made known to the people in his presence the necessity of ordaining a new priest, they turned at once towards Augustine, and demanded of him that he should accept that office. It was with great reluctance and after much opposition that he yielded. He justified abundantly the hopes that had been placed on him. In order to bind him permanently to the Church of Hippo, Valerius had him consecrated (394 or 395) as coadjutor-bishop, by the Numidian primate, Megalius of Calama. Shortly after, 395 or 396, Valerius passed away, and Augustine became bishop of Hippo in his place. He did not change his previous manner of life, and kept up with the clerics of his household the habits of a monastic community. He was especially zealous in preaching, and often discoursed to the people on five successive days, sometimes twice in one day. He was also tireless in the service of the poor. Like Ambrose, he broke up and sold the Church plate in order to succour the needy and to redeem captives[1]. Withal, he was strongly drawn towards literary labors. From his early youth such occupations had become a second nature to him; he now found in them a change and a recreation amid his official duties and solicitudes. The great ecclesiastical questions of the time appealed constantly to him; his conflict with heresy and schism closed only with his life. There were still in Africa and in Hippo itself many Manichæans, a circumstance that caused him to continue with energy the literary refutation of Manichæism that he began at Rome after his baptism. The following noble words from an anti-Manichæan work of 396 or 397 furnish the key-note of these controversies: «Let those rage against you who know not what toil it takes to discover the truth, and how difficult it is to free one's self from error. I must show you as much patience as my friends exhibited to me when I wandered about foolishly and blindly in the errors that you now cherish»[2] Another grave problem of the time was the Donatist schism, a source of profound suffering for the African Church (§ 89, 2). Since his ordination to the priesthood, Augustine had opposed its progress with great energy, in his sermons, and also by public disputations and correspondence with the heads of the schism. It was only in view of the increasing violence of the sectaries, and after much hesitation and reluctance, that he yielded

[1] *Possid.*, Vita Augustini, c. 24.

[2] Contra ep. Manich. quam voc. fund., 2, 2—3.

to the decision of his fellow-bishops to appeal to the secular arm for the suppression of the schism or the restoration of ecclesiastical unity. In June, 411, he gained a splendid victory for the faith in the famous disputation held at Carthage in which two hundred and eighty-six Catholic and two hundredand seventy-nine Donatist bishops took part. Augustine was the soul of the Catholic party; he overthrew with success all the arguments of his opponents, and laid bare all their artifices. In the following year (412), a new enemy, Pelagianism, appeared on the scene; he was destined to consume the remainder of his days in the conflict that was then opening up before him; indeed, it is to this conflict that he owes his foremost place in the history of Catholic doctrine. His contemporaries recognized at once that he was a God-given interpreter and defender of the teachings of the Church concerning divine grace. When Pope Zosimus, at the request of the African episcopate, had condemned Pelagianism (418), the aged Jerome, himself the author of an anti-Pelagian work (§ 93, 7), wrote as follows to St. Augustine: «Hail to thee! The world resounds with thy praise. The Catholics admire and honor thee as the restorer of the ancient faith (conditorem antiquae rursum fidei)» [1]. In the last years of his life, Augustine was destined to drink again of the chalice of sorrow. The Roman empire began to fall apart on all sides; Roman Africa in particular was visited with unspeakable afflictions. The proconsul Boniface uplifted the standard of revolt and called to his aid the Vandals of Spain. These barbarians turned the granary of Italy into a howling desert. It was in vain that Boniface repented and took the field against his pretended friends and allies, he was routed by them and compelled to take refuge with the remnant of his army in the fortress of Hippo. In the third month of the siege, and amid all its horrors, Augustine fell sick of a violent fever. He prayed to God: ut aut hanc civitatem ab hostibus circumdatam liberare dignetur, aut, si aliud ei videtur, suos servos ad perferendam suam voluntatem fortes faciat, aut certe ut me de hoc saeculo ad se accipiat [2]. The latter prayer was heard, God freed His petitioner from earthly woes, Aug. 28., 430. He was seventy-six years of age, and his death took place in the presence of his friends and disciples.

3. RETRACTATIONES AND CONFESSIONES. PHILOSOPHICAL WRITINGS. — The Benedictine edition of the writings of Saint Augustine (Paris, 1679 ff.), the basis of all later editions, rightly begins with: Retractationum libri duo, [3] and: Confessionum libri tredecim [4]. In the former work written toward the end of his life, about 427, he surveys with a critical eye the entire field of his literary labors since his conversion in 386. He draws up a chronological list of all his

[1] Ep. 195, inter Epp. S. Aug.
[2] *Possid.*, l. c., c. 29.
[3] *Migne,* PL., xxxii. 583—656.
[4] Ib., xxxii. 659—868.

writings, with the exception of his letters and discourses: opera nonaginta tria in libris ducentis triginta duobus[1]. He frequently adds valuable information concerning the occasion and purpose, the concept and the composition of his writings, and sometimes contributes corrections of the same, especially where he thought himself inexact in doctrinal matters. Of this work he wrote as follows to a friend: Retractabam opuscula mea, et si quid in eis me offenderet vel alios offendere posset, partim reprehendendo, partim defendendo, quod legi deberet et posset operabar[2]. Naturally this work is of fundamental importance for the so-called higher criticism of his literary legacy. It must be read in connection with the: Indiculus librorum, tractatuum et epistolarum S. Augustini, attached to his life (see no. 2) written by Possidius. The *Confessiones,* written about 400, is one of his most famous works. Its first nine books were composed in order to prove by his personal experience the truth of a principle laid down at the beginning: Fecisti nos ad te (Domine), et inquietum est cor nostrum, donec requiescat in te. In these nine books he depicts with fulness the story of his mental development until the death of his mother in 387 The tenth book exhibits him as he was at the time of its composition (quis adhuc sim, ecce in ipso tempore confessionum mearum)[3]. The last three books contain meditations on the creation-narrative in Genesis. Formally, the work is an outpouring of his heart before the all-knowing God; it is to his Maker that he constantly addresses himself throughout the work. He describes as follows its contents and purpose: Confessionum mearum libri tredecim et de malis et de bonis meis Deum laudant iustum et bonum atque in eum excitant humanum intellectum et affectum[4]. These and other expressions make it clear that Augustine understood by the word «confessiones» not so much the manifestation of his thoughts and deeds as the praise of God. There is positively no foundation for the suspicions expressed by Harnack and Boissier concerning the historical reality of this account of the conversion of St. Augustine. — In the first volume of the Benedictine edition these works are followed by his philosophical writings. They are among the earliest efforts of his pen, and belong nearly all to the period before his baptism. A work: De pulchro et apto, written while he was still a professor of rhetoric at Carthage and a Manichæan, has perished; he mentions it in the Confessions[5]. Immediately after his conversion he wrote at Cassiciacum three books: Contra Academicos[6], in refutation of the scepticism of the Neo-Academicians[7]; a dialogue: De beata vita[8], in proof of the truth that the only true

[1] Retract., ii. 67. [2] Ep. 224, 2. [3] Conf., x. 3, 4.
[4] Retract., ii. 6, 1. [5] iv. 13—15 20—27.
[6] *Migne,* PL., xxxii. 905—958. [7] Retract., i. 1.
[8] *Migne,* PL., xxxii. 959—976.

happiness is the knowledge of God [1], a dialogue: De ordine, in two books [2], dealing with the place and office of evil in God's dealing with the world [3], and two books of: Soliloquia or monologues [4], on the means of attaining to super-sensible truths with special reference to the immortality of the soul [5]. The pious works known as: Soliloquia, Meditationes, Manuale, and widely accepted as writings of Augustine, are of mediæval origin [6]. Early in 387, on his return from Cassiciacum to Milan and before his baptism, he undertook to continue and complete the genuine Soliloquia [7]; at the same time he began an encyclopædic treatise on the Seven liberal arts [8]. The continuation just mentioned is known as: De immortalitate animae [9], and remained an unfinished sketch; the work on the seven liberal arts also was never finished. Only the section *De grammatica* was then written; it has reached us in two compendia: the longer one is in Migne [10] Later on, he completed in Africa the section *De musica,* or at least the chapter De rhythmo: De musica libri sex [11] Of the other five sections: De dialectica, De rhetorica, De geometria, De arithmetica, De philosophia, only the first outlines and concepts were prepared. His: Principia dialecticae [12], and his: Principia rhetorices [13], have reached us; the: Categoriae decem ex Aristotele decerptae [14], are probably spurious. His philosophical writings include also the dialogue: De quantitate animae [15], in proof of the immateriality of the soul, and: De magistro [16], an interpretation of Matt. xxiii. 10: Unus est magister vester, Christus. He wrote both these dialogues after his baptism, the first at Rome, the second in Africa [17].

4. APOLOGETIC AND DOGMATIC WRITINGS. — The most important of all the writings of Augustine is his: De civitate Dei [18], in twenty-two books, composed in the years 413—426 and published piecemeal (cf. v 26, 2). It owes its origin to a renewal of pagan accusations against the Christians. Thus, the responsibility for the sack of Rome by Alaric (410) was laid at the door of the latter: the overthrow of polytheism, it was said, had irritated the gods under whose protection the eternal city had grown to be the mistress of the world. This reproach was not a new one, it had been current since the days of the apologists. Augustine is not contented with a refutation of this calumny; he undertakes to establish, for all time, the true relationship of Christianity to paganism; his view embraces not only the present but also the past and the future; the whole

[1] Retract., i. 2. [2] *Migne,* PL., xxxii. 977—1020. [3] Retract., i. 3.
[4] *Migne,* PL., xxxii. 869—904. [5] Retract., i. 4.
[6] *Migne,* PL., xl. 863—898 901—942 951—968. [7] Retract., i. 5.
[8] Ib., i. 6. [9] *Migne,* PL., xxxii. 1021—1034.
[10] Ib., xxxii. 1385—1408. [11] Ib., xxxii. 1081—1194; Retract. i. 11.
[12] *Migne,* PL., xxxii. 1409—1420. [13] Ib., xxxii. 1439—1448.
[14] Ib., xxxii. 1419—1440. [15] Ib., xxxii. 1035—1080.
[16] Ib., xxxii. 1193—1220. [17] Retract., i. 8 12. [18] *Migne,* PL., xli.

course of human history lies open before him, and from the beginning to the end he interprets it with power and insight. His apology for Christianity rises at once to the dignity of a magnificent philosophy of history, a work that towers «like an Alpine peak» over all the other apologies of Christian antiquity He tells us himself[1] that the work is divided into two parts. In the first part (books i—x) he follows an apologetico-polemical purpose: books i—v refute the popular pagan opinion that polytheism was necessary for earthly felicity; books vi—x are directed against the thesis of the (Neoplatonist) philosophers that the worship of the gods was useful for the future life. The second part containing the other twelve books is speculative and metaphysical. In these books he treats of the two great kingdoms (civitates) in and through which goes on the development of life and humanity: the kingdom of God and the kingdom of this world. The kingdom of God is made of His subject angels and men; the sign of the kingdom of this world, its essence at once and its sum total, is apostasy from God. It is only in this time (in hoc saeculo) that these two kingdoms interpenetrate and overlap one another (perplexae invicemque permixtae)[2], because the citizens of the former (the just) still move as pilgrims among the citizens of the other (the wicked). In the first four books of the second part (xi—xiv) he describes the origin of both kingdoms (exortum duarum civitatum), as it is constituted by the creation of the angels and the fall of the apostate angels. In books xv—xviii, he treats of the development and progress of the two kingdoms (excursum earum sive procursum), and in books xix—xxii, their definite purpose and end (debitos fines). The work is specially valuable for the historical and archæological excursus in which it abounds and for which he drew largely on Cicero, Varro and the Hieronymian recension of the Chronicon of Eusebius. Thus the chapters on ancient mythology in the sixth book furnish us with a more accurate knowledge of the contents of the lost work of Varro: Antiquitates rerum humanarum et divinarum. In the little work: De divinatione daemonum[3], written between 406 and 411, he examines the knowledge of the demons concerning the future and compares their predictions with the language of the prophets[4]. The sermon (tractatus): Adversus Judaeos[5], illustrates the justice of God in the rejection of the Jews. The works against the Manichæans will be described in no. 5. — *Dogmatic works:* His only systematic account of Catholic dogma is the: Enchiridion ad Laurentium sive: De fide, spe et caritate liber unus[6] written about 421. It was written in reply to the request of Laurentius, a Roman layman, who had asked

[1] Retract., ii. 43. [2] De civ. Dei, i. 35; xi. 1.
[3] *Migne,* PL., xl. 581—592. [4] Retract., ii. 30.
[5] *Migne,* PL., xlii. 51—64. [6] Ib., xl. 231—290.

him for a correct and handy compendium of Catholic teaching[1] The work: De doctrina christiana properly belongs to his exegetical writings (see no. 8); the: De vera religione is mostly an anti-Manichæan work (see no. 5). In the: De fide et symbolo[2], written in 393, he gave an exposition of the Apostles' Creed[3] Quite similar in contents is his discourse (sermo): De symbolo ad catechumenos[4]. In the: De fide rerum quae non videntur, a work or rather a sermon composed after 399, he demonstrates the reasonableness of belief in the invisible and the supernatural[5]. In the: De fide et operibus[6], written early in 413, he shows that faith alone without good works is not sufficient for salvation[7] The longest and most important of his dogmatic works is the: De Trinitate[8], begun about 410 but not finished until after 416[9]. It consists of two parts: in the first seven books he develops the true doctrine of the Trinity according to Holy Scripture, while in the other eight he undertakes a scientific illustration and defence of this doctrine. The human mind, an image of God, furnishes him with numerous analogies to the Trinity: mens et notitia qua se novit et amor quo se notitiamque suam diligit; memoria et intelligentia et voluntas, and the like (cf. xv. 3, 5). He is conscious, however, that it is impossible to demonstrate philosophically the truth and necessity of this mystery Of these fifteen books he says himself: Nimis operosi sunt et a paucis eos intelligi posse arbitror[10]. The two books: De coniugiis adulterinis[11], written about 419, defend the indissolubility of Christian marriage, and the invalidity of a second marriage of one party during the life-time of the other[12] In the treatise: De cura gerenda pro mortuis[13], written about 421, he answers a question of St. Paulinus of Nola concerning burials in the basilicas of the martyrs: such a custom is useful in so far as it reminds the faithful of the duty to pray for the dead, and thereby procures the intercession of the martyrs[14] In three works entitled: Quaestiones, he treats a number of dogmatic and exegetical problems: De diversis quaestionibus lxxxiii liber unus[15], begun at the end of 388[16]; De diversis quaestionibus ad Simplicianum libri duo[17], written about 397[18]; De octo Dulcitii quaestionibus liber unus[19], written probably in 422 or 425[20]

5. DOGMATICO-POLEMICAL WRITINGS. — At the request of the deacon Quodvultdeus of Carthage he composed towards the end of

[1] Retract., ii. 63. [2] *Migne*, PL., xl. 181—196. [3] Retract., i. 17.
[4] *Migne*, PL., xl. 627—636. [5] Ib., xl. 171—180.
[6] Ib., xl. 197—230. [7] Retract., ii. 38.
[8] *Migne*, PL., xlii. 819—1098. [9] Retract., ii. 15. [10] Ep. 169, 1, 1.
[11] *Migne*, PL., xl. 451—486. [12] Retract., ii. 57.
[13] *Migne*, PL., xl. 591—610. [14] Retract., ii. 64.
[15] *Migne*, PL., xl. 11—100. [16] Retract., i. 26.
[17] *Migne*, PL., xl. 101—148. [18] Retract., ii. 1.
[19] *Migne*, PL., xl. 147—170. [20] Retract., ii. 65.

his life, about 428, a compendium of the history of heresies entitled: De haeresibus[1]. In this work Augustine shows his acquaintance with similar treatises of his predecessors Epiphanius and Philastrius (§ 89, 4) and makes use of them; he is content, however, with exhibiting the original source and the fundamental ideas of each heresy; from Simon Magus to Pelagius he enumerates eighty-eight heresies. He never finished the second part of this work, though he says in the preface: in posterioribus autem partibus quid faciat haereticum disputabitur — *Anti-Manichæan works:* Some of the heresies described in the above-mentioned work were the occasion of many other writings of our Saint who incessantly opposed all heresy both by voice and pen; for several decades he was the vigorous opponent of Manichæism, Donatism and Pelagianism. To the dualism of the Manichæans who looked on good and evil as being equally necessary, he opposes the monism of the good principle. Even the Old Testament is a revelation of the one true God. There is no contradiction between the Old and the New Testament, as the Manichæans pretended; on the contrary, the most perfect harmony exists between them: quanquam et in Vetere Novum lateat et in Novo Vetus pateat[2]. The cause of evil is the free will of the creature, evil is not a substance, but an accident of good, a negation, a privation, a harm suffered by nature, a damage done to her integrity. Hence there can exist purely good things, but purely evil things cannot exist: sola ergo bona alicubi esse possunt, sola mala nusquam[3]. Evil cannot disturb the order and the beauty of the universe, nor can it escape the laws by which divine Providence rules the world, on the contrary, it must also serve the divine purpose. It seemed better to God that He should bring good out of evil than not to permit the existence of evil: potentius et melius esse iudicans etiam de malis bene facere quam mala esse non sinere[4] If we add that when occasion offers, he holds up to scorn the immoral life and manners of the Manichæans, we shall have indicated with sufficient clearness the circle of ideas within which his anti-Manichæan writings move. The earliest of them are: De moribus ecclesiae catholicae et de moribus Manichæorum libri duo[5], and: De libero arbitrio libri tres[6], both of them begun at Rome in 388 after his baptism, but finished in Africa, the first about 389, the second in 395[7] Two other works were written during his retirement at Tagaste in 389—390[8]; for De Genesi see no. 8; they are: De Genesi contra Manichæos libri duo[9], and: De vera religione[10]. While still a priest in Hippo, he wrote, apparently

[1] *Migne,* PL., xlii. 21—50. [2] Quaest. in Heptateuchum, ii. 73.
[3] De civ. Dei, xii. 3. [4] Ib., xiii. 1, 2; Enchiridion 27.
[5] *Migne,* PL., xxxii. 1309—1378. [6] Ib., xxxii. 1221—1310.
[7] Retract., i. 7 9. [8] Ib., i. 10 13. [9] *Migne,* PL., xxxiv. 173—220.
[10] Ib., xxxiv. 121—172.

in 391: De utilitate credendi ad Honoratum[1], and: De duabus animabus contra Manichæos[2], also (392) the: Acta seu disputatio contra Fortunatum Manichæum, the proceedings of a public controversy held at Hippo Aug. 28.—29., 392[3]; also, about 394: Contra Adimantum Manichæi discipulum[4]. In 396 or 397 he wrote the: Contra epistolam Manichæi quam vocant fundamenti[5]; about 400 the: Contra Faustum Manichæum libri triginta tres[6]. The: De actis cum Felice Manichæo libri duo[7], represent a public controversy of Dec. 7 and 12., 404. De natura boni contra Manichæos[8] was written after 404; Contra Secundinum Manichæum[9]; Secundini Manichæi epistola ad Augustinum was written about 405[10]. His treatise: Ad Orosium Contra Priscillianistas et Origenistas[11], was written in 415, in refutation of the Spanish heresy that was based on Manichæan principles (§ 89, 3). The assertion that the Old Testament is the work of evil spirits and not the work of God was thoroughly refuted by him in two books: Contra adversarium legis et prophetarum[12], written early in 420. The: Commonitorium quomodo sit agendum cum Manichæis qui convertuntur[13], is considered to be spurious by the Benedictine editors. The: De fide contra Manichæos[14], is very probably the work of Evodius, a friend of Augustine, who in 396 or 397 became bishop of Uzalum in proconsular Africa († Oct. 16., 424).

6. DOGMATICO-POLEMICAL WRITINGS (CONTINUED). — *Anti-Donatist writings:* Augustine himself has defined the issues of the Donatist controversy: Duo mala vestra vobis obiicimus, unum quod erratis in baptismi quaestione, alterum quod vos ab eis qui de hac re verum sentiunt separatis[15]. The Donatists maintained that the validity, power, and effect of baptism depended on the subjective conditions of the baptizing and baptized persons. According to Augustine, baptism is a means of grace that produces its effect objectively. There is no baptism of Donatus or Rogatus or any such, but only the one baptism of Christ that of and by itself transmits grace by reason of innate divine power, independently of all human merit or demerit[16]. Similarly the other contention of the Donatists is wrong, viz. that they are the only true Church of Christ, which

[1] Ib., xlii. 65—92. [2] Ib., xlii. 93—112. [3] Ib., xlii. 111—130.
[4] Ib., xlii. 129—172; cf. Retract., i. 14 15 16 22.
[5] *Migne*, PL., xlii. 173—206; Retract., ii. 2.
[6] *Migne*, PL., xlii. 207—518; Retract., ii. 7.
[7] *Migne*, PL., xlii. 519—552; Retract., ii. 8.
[8] *Migne*, PL., xlii. 551—572; Retract., ii. 9.
[9] *Migne*, PL., xlii. 577—602.
[10] *Migne*, PL., xlii. 571—578; Retract., ii. 10.
[11] *Migne*, PL., xlii. 669—678; Retract., ii. 44.
[12] *Migne*, PL., xlii. 604—666; Retract., ii. 58.
[13] *Migne*, PL., xlii. 1153—1156. [14] Ib., xlii. 1139—1154.
[15] Contra Cresconium, iii. 3. [16] Ep. 93, 11, 46—49.

can have for its members only the perfectly just or those who are without sin. The Church of Christ is that Church, and that one only, which has the testimony of Holy Scripture, which has been ever growing and spreading since the time of Christ, and is now the Catholic Church that includes all the peoples of the world. In her temporal development this Church is a mixed society, in which dwell both the good and the bad, a net in which are found both good and bad fish, a flock in which the sheep and the goats are close together, a house with vessels of honor and vessels of dishonor, a field in which the grain and the chaff grow side by side[1]. Finally Donatism raised the question of the relations of Church and State, or rather the relations of the civil power to liberty of conscience and faith. We have seen (no. 2) that, when pacific means had failed, the Donatist schism was suppressed by force. Augustine justifies this policy by reference to the parable of the banquet. The householder gives the order: Exite in vias et sepes et quoscumque inveneritis cogite intrare[2], and Augustine expounds this text as follows: Hi qui inveniuntur in viis et in sepibus, id est in haeresibus et schismatibus, coguntur intrare[3]. His earliest anti-Donatist work is a rhythmic poem written towards, the end of 393, entitled: Psalmus contra partem Donati, or Psalmus abecedarius, because its twenty strophes each begin with a letter of the alphabet in regular order from A to V[4]. Its object was to explain to the simple faithful the history and the ideas of the Donatists, for that purpose it was to be sung by the people in the churches[5]. A contemporaneous work: Contra epistolam Donati, has perished[6]. He composed about 400 the works: Contra epistolam Parmeniani libri tres[7], and: De baptismo contra Donatistas libri septem[8]. A somewhat earlier work in two books: Contra partem Donati[9], and a somewhat later one: Contra quod attulit Centurius a Donatistis[10], have not reached us. He began in 400 and finished in 402: Contra litteras Petiliani Donatistae. Cirtensis episcopi, libri tres[11]. To the same period is usually ascribed a rather long circular: Ad Catholicos epistola contra Donatistas, vulgo: De unitate ecclesiae liber unus[12]; its genuineness, however, is not admitted by all. He wrote about 406 the: Contra Cresconium grammaticum partis Donati libri quatuor[13]. Three other works of the same period have perished: Probationum et testimoniorum contra Donatistas liber, Contra nescio quem Donatistam liber, Admonitio Donatistarum de Maximianistis[14] The: Liber testimoniorum fidei

[1] Ep. 93, 9, 34; 12, 50 etc. [2] Lk. xiv. 23. [3] Ep. 185, 6, 24.
[4] *Migne*, PL., xliii. 23—32. [5] Retract., i. 20. [6] Ib., i. 21.
[7] *Migne*, PL., xliii. 33—108. [8] Ib., xliii. 107—244; Retract., ii. 17 18.
[9] Retract., ii. 5. [10] Ib., ii. 19.
[11] *Migne*, PL., xliii. 245—388; Retract., ii. 25.
[12] *Migne*, PL., xliii. 391—446. [13] Ib., xliii. 445—594; Retract., ii. 26.
[14] Retract., ii. 27 28 29.

contra Donatistas, edited by Pitra (1888) as a work of Augustine, does not belong to him, nor was it written against the Donatists, but against the Arians and Macedonians. Augustine devoted a special work to the Maximianists, a rigorist faction of the Donatists: De Maximianistis contra Donatistas[1], but it has perished. He wrote probably about 410: De unico baptismo contra Petilianum, ad Constantinum, liber unus[2]. The: Breviculus collationis cum Donatistis, is an extract from the acts of the colloquy on religion held at Carthage in 411[3]. The work: Ad Donatistas post collationem liber unus, was written in 412[4]. Mention must also be made of his: Sermo ad Cæsareensis ecclesiae plebem Emerito praesente habitus[5], Ad Emeritum Donatistarum episcopum post collationem liber unus[6], De gestis cum Emerito Cæsareensi Donatistarum episcopo liber unus, written in 418[7], and: Contra Gaudentium Donatistarum episcopum libri duo, written about 420[8]. In the disputation at Carthage Emeritus, bishop of Cæsarea Mauretania (Algiers), and Gaudentius of Tamaguda (Timgad) had been the leaders on the Donatist side. The: Sermo de Rusticano subdiacono a Donatistis rebaptizato et in diaconum ordinato[9], is a spurious work.

7. DOGMATICO-POLEMICAL WRITINGS (CONTINUED). — *Anti-Pelagian works:* The error to the refutation of which Augustine consecrated the evening of his life took its name from the British monk Pelagius, whose teaching was developed and formulated more definitely by Caelestius, a man of obscure origin. The most zealous defender of this error was Julianus, bishop of Eclanum, a writer of eminent dialectical skill, combative spirit and remarkable self-reliance. We cannot outline more clearly the nature of the Pelagian error than by reproducing the summary notice which Augustine consecrates to it in the last chapter of his De haeresibus (see no. 5). In this compendium of Pelagianism he states, briefly at once and clearly, its fundamental concepts and his own reasons for rejecting them. The Pelagians, he says, are so inimical to divine grace through which we have escaped the power of darkness and are raised to the dignity of children of God, that they believe men capable of fulfilling the divine commandments without its help. Our Lord, on the contrary, has said: Nemo venit ad me, nisi fuerit ei datum a Patre meo[10], and again: Sine me nihil potestis facere[11]. When the brethren reproached Pelagius that he eliminated divine grace from our lives, he replied that grace was given to men only in order that they might accomplish more easily

[1] Retract., ii. 35. [2] *Migne,* PL., xliii. 595—614; Retract., ii. 34.
[3] *Migne,* PL., xliii. 613—650; Retract., ii. 39.
[4] *Migne,* PL., xliii. 651—690; Retract., ii. 40. [5] *Migne,* PL., xliii. 689—698.
[6] Known only from Retract., ii. 46. [7] *Migne,* PL., xliii. 697—706; Retract., ii. 51.
[8] *Migne,* PL., xliii. 707—752; Retract., ii. 59.
[9] *Migne,* PL., xliii. 753—758 [10] John vi. 66. [11] John xv. 5

what, in its absence, they were still competent to accomplish by nature. Pelagius contended, therefore, that man could fulfil all the commandments of God without the grace of God, although it would be more difficult for him to do so. According to the Pelagians, that divine grace without which we can do no good is simply the free will of man, the natural gift of God bestowed on man without any previous merit on his part. God does aid us, but through His law and His doctrine, by which means we learn what we ought to do and what we ought to hope for. There is no such thing, however, as a gift of the Spirit of God by which we are enabled to do that which we otherwise have recognized it to be our duty to do. The Pelagians also reject the prayers which the Church offers up, either for unbelievers and the conversion of those who resist divine teaching, or for the faithful that their faith may increase and they may be preserved therein, these gifts, they say, are not imparted by God to men, they are in our own power, for that grace of God which frees us from our sins is given to us according to the measure of our own merits. It is true that Pelagius denied this principle in presence of his judges, the bishops of Palestine (Synods of Jerusalem and Diospolis, in 415), but he did so only in order to escape condemnation; he continued to advocate this teaching in his later writings. They also maintain that the life of the just here below is quite free from sin, and that it is such just souls who constitute the Church of Christ on this earth; in this way the Church is, indeed, without spot or stain[1]. As though it were not the Church of Christ throughout the entire world which prays to God: Dimitte nobis debita nostra![2] The Pelagians deny also that little children are subject to the old death by reason of their descent from Adam; on the contrary, they are born free from all taint of original sin, so that there is in them nothing that a second birth could remit; through baptism they merely acquire membership in the kingdom of God, but no internal renovation or freedom from guilt and its punishment; even if not baptized, they would nevertheless have a life of eternal felicity, though not in the kingdom of God. Adam himself, they said, would have died, even if he had not sinned; when his death did occur, it was not a punishment (of his sin) but a result of nature. — Augustine began his long conflict against this heresy with a work in three books written in 412: De peccatorum meritis et remissione et de baptismo parvulorum ad Marcellinum[3]. It is in the first of these books that are found the loci classici for the teaching of Augustine on the nature of sanctifying grace. At the end of 412 followed: De spiritu et littera ad Marcellinum liber

[1] Cf. Eph. v. 27. [2] Mt. vi. 12.
[3] *Migne,* PL., xliv. 109—200; Retract. ii. 33.

unus[1], in which he defends the necessity of internal grace (spiritus) as distinguished from the external grace of the law (littera), in order to *facere et perficere iustitiam*[2]. In: De natura et gratia, ad Timasium et Jacobum, contra Pelagium liber unus, written in 415, he refuted the work of Pelagius *De natura*[3] Ad episcopos Eutropium et Paulum epistola sive Liber de perfectione iustitiae hominis[4], was written at the end of 415, against the work entitled *Definitiones* and current under the name of Caelestius. The: De gestis Pelagii, ad Aurelium episcopum, liber unus, written at the end of 417, summarizes the discussions of the Synod of Diospolis (415) in the matter of Pelagianism[5]. De gratia Christi et de peccato originali, contra Pelagium et Caelestium, libri duo[6], were written in 418; in the beginning of 419 he wrote: De nuptiis et concupiscentia, ad Valerium Comitem, libri duo[7]; towards the end of the same year: De anima et eius origine libri quatuor[8]; in 420 or a little after: Contra duas epistolas Pelagianorum ad Bonifacium Romanae Ecclesiae episcopum, libri quatuor[9]; in 421 or a little after: Contra Julianum haeresis Pelagianae defensorem libri sex[10]. This work is a very close refutation of the Libri IV ad Turbantium episcopum adversus Augustini librum primum de nuptiis et concupiscentia, published by Julian of Eclanum in 419 or 420 (§ 74, 12). Apropos of a letter of Augustine written in 418[11] some monks of Adrumetum began, about 424, a controversy concerning the relations of divine grace and the free will of man. For their instruction and pacification Augustine wrote about 426 or 427 two works: De gratia et libero arbitrio ad Valentinum et cum illo monachos liber unus[12], and: De correptione et gratia ad eumdem Valentinum et cum illo monachos Hadrumeticos liber unus[13]. These discussions at Adrumetum were the prelude of Semipelagianism, which soon found a home in Southern Gaul, especially in the isles of Lerins and in the vicinity of Marseilles, where its defenders were both numerous and energetic. Augustine was informed of this movement by two Gauls, Prosper and Hilarius; his two works addressed to these correspondents in 428 or 429 are really one, and contain a complete description and defence of his teachings concerning divine grace: De praedestinatione sanctorum liber ad Prosperum et Hilarium primus[14], and: De dono perseverantiae liber ad Prosperum et Hilarium secundus[15]. He was

[1] *Migne*, PL., xliv. 201—246. [2] Retract., ii. 37.
[3] *Migne*, PL., xliv. 247—290; Retract., ii. 42.
[4] *Migne*, PL., xliv. 291—318. [5] Ib., xliv. 319—360; Retract., ii. 47.
[6] *Migne*, PL., xliv. 359—410; Retract., ii. 50.
[7] *Migne*, PL., xliv. 413—474; Retract., ii. 53.
[8] *Migne*, PL., xliv. 475—548; Retract., ii. 56.
[9] *Migne*, PL., xliv. 549—638; Retract., ii. 61.
[10] *Migne*, PL., xliv. 641—874; Retract., ii. 62.
[11] Ep. 194, ad Sixtum Romanum. [12] *Migne*, PL., xliv. 881—912.
[13] Ib., xlix. 915—946; cf. Retract., ii. 66—67.
[14] *Migne*, PL., xliv. 959—992. [15] Ib., xlv. 993—1034.

compelled to enter the arena once more by a new work of Julian: Libri VIII ad Florum episcopum adversus Augustini librum secundum de nuptiis et concupiscentia. The exhaustive reply of our Saint follows Julian step by step; it was destined, however, to remain unfinished: Contra secundam Juliani responsionem imperfectum opus sex libros complectens[1]. In the tenth volume of the Benedictine edition there were published as an appendix to these anti-Pelagian writings of Augustine three works entitled: Hypomnesticon contra Pelagianos et Caelestianos[2], probably written by Marius Mercator (§ 95, 1), De praedestinatione et gratia suspecti auctoris liber[3], and: De praedestinatione Dei libellus ignoti auctoris[4] — *Anti-Arian writings:* In 418 an anonymous summary of Arian doctrine (quidam sermo Arianorum sine nomine auctoris sui) was sent by a friendly hand to Augustine with a request for its refutation[5]. His criticism, to which he prefixed the entire text of the Arian work, is entitled: Contra sermonem Arianorum liber unus[6]. In 427 or 428 a public disputation between Augustine and Maximinus, an Arian bishop, took place at Hippo. We have the outcome of Augustine's part in its proceedings in the: Collatio cum Maximino Arianorum episcopo[7] The Arian bishop consumed the allotted time with his lengthy discourse, so that Augustine could only reply by the publication of his work: Contra Maximinum haereticum Arianorum episcopum libri duo[8].

8. EXEGETICAL WRITINGS. — Among the exegetical works of St. Augustine the most important is his: De doctrina christiana, begun about 397 and finished about 426[9]. He tells us in the beginning of the first book that he wrote it in order to elucidate two questions that were the foundations of all biblical science, i. e. how to investigate the meaning of the Scriptures, and how to make it known to the faithful: Duae sunt res quibus nititur omnis tractatio Scripturarum, modus inveniendi quae intelligenda sunt et modus proferendi quae intellecta sunt. The three books of the first part may, therefore, be called Biblical Hermeneutics, in the fourth book, or second part, he deals with the principles of Christian Homiletics. Already before his ordination to the priesthood he had begun a controversial exposition of Genesis: De Genesi contra Manichæos (see no. 5). At a later date he grew dissatisfied with this production; it seemed to him that he had paid too little attention to the literal sense of the biblical text: quoniam secundum allegoricam significationem Scripturae verba tractaveram, non ausus naturalium rerum tanta secreta ad litteram exponere[10]. About 393 he undertook to treat the same

[1] *Migne,* PL., xlv. 1049—1608. [2] Ib., xlv. 1611—1664.
[3] Ib., xlv. 1665—1678. [4] Ib., xlv. 1677—1680. [5] Retract., ii. 52.
[6] *Migne,* PL., xlii. 677—708. [7] Ib., xlii. 709—742.
[8] Ib., xlii., 743—814. [9] *Migne,* PL., xxxiv. 15—122; Retract., ii. 4.
[10] Retract., i. 18.

subject in a new work but gave it up in consequence of the great difficulty of the subject: in Scripturis exponendis tirocinium meum sub tanta sarcinae mole succubuit[1]. He did not get beyond the rough sketch which he entitled: De Genesi ad litteram imperfectus liber[2]. About 400 he devoted the last three books of the Confessiones to the creation-narrative of Genesis (see no. 3). Finally, during the years 401—415, he produced: De Genesi ad litteram libri duodecim[3]; this work does not get beyond the expulsion of Adam from Paradise, and contains more questions than answers: Plura quaesita quam inventa sunt et eorum quae inventa sunt pauciora firmata, cetera vero ita posita velut adhuc requirenda sint[4]. To the exposition of the Heptateuch (the five books of Moses, with Josue and Judges) he dedicated about 419 two works: Locutionum libri septem[5], and: Quaestionum in Heptateuchum libri septem[6]; the first illustrative of unusual terms or phrases in the Latin text of Scripture, the second explanatory of such passages as contain a difficulty[7] The: Adnotationum in Job liber unus[8], contains disconnected marginal notes of the Saint on the book of Job, unintelligently compiled about 400 by an unknown hand[9]. Enarrationes in Psalmos is the title of a series of very beautiful and deeply spiritual homilies on all the Psalms, written at divers times: some of them were never delivered orally; they fill one large folio in the Benedictine edition[10]. In the: De consensu evangelistarum libri quatuor, written about 400, he discusses and explains pretended contradictions in the four Gospel-narratives[11]. Separate texts of Matthew (book 1) and Luke (book 2) are explained in: Quaestionum evangeliorum libri duo, written about the same time[12]. About 393 he wrote: De sermone Domini in monte secundum Matthaeum libri duo[13] The: Quaestionum septemdecim in evangelium secundum Matthaeum liber unus[14], is a spurious work. In Johannis evangelium tractatus CXXIV[15], and: In epistolam Johannis ad Parthos (Ep. I. Joh.) tractatus x[16], are homilies delivered about 416 and committed to writing by the author himself. On the epistles of St. Paul there are extant three brief treatises: Expositio quarumdam propositionum ex epistola ad Romanos[17], Epistolae ad Romanos inchoata expositio[18], Epistolae ad Galatas expositio[19], all

[1] Ib. [2] *Migne,* PL., xxxiv. 219—246. [3] Ib., xxxiv. 245—486.
[4] Retract., ii. 24. [5] *Migne,* xxxiv. 485—546.
[6] Ib., xxxiv. 547—824. [7] Retract., ii. 54 55.
[8] *Migne,* PL.. xxxiv. 825—886. [9] Retract., ii. 13.
[10] *Migne,* PL., xxxvi—xxxvii.
[11] Ib., xxxiv. 1041—1230; Retract., ii. 16.
[12] *Migne,* PL., xxxv. 1321—1364; Retract., ii. 12.
[13] *Migne,* PL., xxxiv. 1229—1308; Retract., i. 19.
[14] *Migne,* PL., xxxv. 1365—1376. [15] Ib., xxxv. 1379—1976.
[16] Ib., xxxv. 1977—2062. [17] Ib., xxxv. 2063—2088.
[18] Ib., xxxv. 2087—2106. [19] Ib., xxxv. 2105—2148.

three written about 394[1]. An: Expositio epistolae Jacobi, has perished[2]. The: Expositio in Apocalypsim b. Johannis, current under the name of Augustine[3], is not his work; and the same is to be said of the diffuse: Quaestiones Veteris et Novi Testamenti[4]. We have already mentioned (no. 4) three genuine works *Quaestiones,* partly dogmatic and partly exegetical. — Augustine was ignorant of Hebrew, and from some of his expressions it has often been inferred that he was also ignorant of Greek: Graecae linguae perparum assecutus sum et prope nihil[5]. Nevertheless, countless other passages of his works show that he could read and understand Greek texts, perhaps with some difficulty and loss of time. In general he uses a Latin version of the Bible, usually the one long current in Africa; at times he makes use also of the Hieronymian version, but whenever the meaning of the Latin text is difficult or dubious, he has recourse to the Greek. The first principle of his hermeneutics[6] is the necessity of ascertaining of the true literal sense, and to this principle he remains faithful, particularly in his works of scientific exegesis. In his homilies, however, e. g.: Enarrationes in Psalmos, Tractatus in evangelium Johannis, In Ep. I. Johannis, he is thoroughly at home only in the broader field of mystic and allegorical exegesis. On all points of Christian faith and morals he finds the Old Testament a witness only a little less outspoken than the New Testament, and he selects the texts of his homilies as readily from the Psalms as from the Gospels. It is Augustine who first put forth the idea of a *multiplex sensus literalis.* He maintains, or at least surmises, that, whatever truth can be found in a phrase of Holy Scripture, was then and there intended by the sacred writer or rather by the Holy Spirit[7]. Were this true, a scientific exegesis of Scripture would be impossible; Augustine puts it forth only as his own opinion, and one not shared by the majority of his contemporaries; very often, moreover, he tacitly abandons it. In the interpretation of the Scriptures he considers the authority of the Church as the highest rule and criterion both in theory and practice: Consulat (interpres) regulam fidei quam de Scripturarum planioribus locis et ecclesiae auctoritate percepit[8]; quaerendi dubitatio catholicae fidei metas non debet excedere[9]. In the Scriptures there can be found no other teaching than that of the Church: Non autem praecipit Scriptura nisi caritatem non autem asserit nisi catholicam fidem[10]. The heretic interprets incor-

[1] Retract., i. 23—25. [2] Ib., ii. 32.
[3] *Migne,* PL., xxxv. 2417—2452. [4] Ib., xxxv. 2213—2416; cf. § 90, 10.
[5] Contra litteras Petiliani, ii. 38, 91; cf. De trinit., iii., prooem. 1.
[6] De doctrina christiana, i—iii.
[7] Conf., xii. 31, 42; De doctrina christ., iii. 27, 38.
[8] De doctrina christ., iii. 2, 2. [9] De Gen. ad litt. imperf., i. 1.
[10] De doctrina christ., iii. 10, 15.

rectly the Scripture because he is a heretic, and not vice versa: Multi haeretici ad suam sententiam quae praeter fidem est catholicae disciplinae, expositionem Scripturarum divinarum trahere consueverunt[1]. He insists constantly on the inspired character and canonical dignity of the biblical books; he defends their inerrancy with special energy in the De consensu evangelistarum and in the above-mentioned controversy with St. Jerome (§ 93, 5); in these letters to Jerome are found the oft repeated words: if once an officious lie is admitted in the Scripture, no sentence of it will be guarded from a similar accusation (admisso enim semel in tantum auctoritatis fastigium officioso aliquo mendacio, nulla illorum librorum particula remanebit, quae non ad mentientis auctoris consilium officiumque referatur)[2]. Apparent errors in the Bible result either from defects in the manuscripts, or from mistakes of the translators, or from the imperfect intelligence of the reader: si aliquid in eis offendero literis quod videatur contrarium veritati, nihil aliud quam vel mendosum esse codicem, vel interpretem non assecutum esse quod dictum est, vel me minime intellexisse non ambigam[3].

9. WORKS OF MORAL AND PRACTICAL THEOLOGY. — The popular instruction: De agone christiano[4], was written about 396 or 397, in order to show the Christian how he might overcome evil by faith[5]. Towards the end of his life, perhaps in 427, he made up from the Old and the New Testament a book of moral precepts; he intended it to be a mirror of Christian morality, hence the name of: Speculum; it begins with the words: Quis ignorat[6]. In its original form the texts of Scripture or testimonia were quoted from the Old-Itala version, but in the extant manuscripts corresponding texts from the Hieronymian version have been very frequently substituted. He has been wrongly credited, even quite recently, with the authorship of another very similar work, the: Liber de divinis scripturis sive Speculum; it begins with *Audi Israhel,* and was first published by H. Vignier in 1654; it is not found in the Benedictine edition and is therefore lacking in Migne. Two other works, each entitled: Speculum or Speculum peccatoris[7], are universally rejected as spurious. The appendix to the sixth volume of the Benedictine edition contains many other spurious ascetico-moral writings. The: De Vita christiana[8], is distinctly Pelagian in tone; perhaps it is a work of Pelagius himself (see no. 16). The: Liber exhortationis, vulgo de salutaribus documentis[9], belongs to St. Paulinus of Aquileia (§ 67, 11). In two genuine works Augustine discusses the nature and the reprehensibility

[1] De Gen. ad litt. imperf., i. 1. [2] Ep. 28, 3, 3.
[3] Ep. 82, 1, 3; cf. Contra Faustum Man., xi. 5.
[4] *Migne,* PL., xl. 289—310. [5] Retract., ii. 3.
[6] *Migne,* PL., xxxiv. 887—1040. [7] Ib., xl. 967—984; 983—992.
[8] Ib., xl. 1031—1046. [9] Ib., xl. 1047—1078.

of lying: De mendacio[1], written about 395, and: Contra mendacium[2], written about 420. The former was a hasty composition, and later on satisfied its author so little that he regretted its publication[3]. He expended all the more industry on the second work in which he teaches ex professo the illicit character of a lie under any circumstances[4]. The little treatises: De continentia[5], written about 395, and: De patientia[6], written probably before 418, are homiletic discourses. De bono coniugali[7], and: De sancta virginitate[8], were written about 401, in reply to Jovinian's denunciation of celibacy. It was said that in his reply to Jovinian (Adversus Jovinianum; § 93, 7) Jerome had exalted virginity at the expense of matrimony: Jactabatur Joviniano responderi non potuisse cum laude, sed cum vituperatione nuptiarum[9]. To avoid this charge, Augustine begins by placing in their true light the institution of marriage and its dignity; he is able, there after, to treat of virginity with more freedom and security[10]. The superiority of the widowed estate to matrimony is the subject of: De bono viduitatis liber seu Epistola ad Julianam viduam[11], written about 414. His work: De opere monachorum[12], exercised a very great influence: in it he maintained that according to the Holy Scriptures monks should labor with their hands[13]. — The: De doctrina christiana (see no. 8), offers in its second part a treatise of pastoral theology; the fourth book, as already indicated, is really the earliest attempt at systematic Homiletics. Similarly, the earliest theory of catechetic instruction is his: De catechizandis rudibus[14], written about 400 at the request of Deogratias, a deacon of Carthage. We have to regret the loss of his work: Contra Hilarum, in defence of the ecclesiastical custom at Carthage: ut hymni ad altare dicerentur de Psalmorum libro, sive ante oblationem, sive cum distribueretur populo quod fuisset oblatum[15].

10. SERMONS, LETTERS, POEMS. — Apart from his biblical *Enarrationes* and *Tractatus* (see no. 8) numerous *Sermones* have always been current under his name. The fifth volume of the Benedictine edition[16] contains three hundred and sixty-three Sermones that are undoubtedly genuine, divided into four groups: Sermones de scripturis Veteris et Novi Testamenti (1—183), Sermones de tempore (184 to 272), Sermones de sanctis (273—340), Sermones de diversis (341 to 363). They were either dictated by Augustine himself after he had preached them, or were written down in the church by others. Next in order are certain Sermones dubii (364—395), also: Sermonum

[1] *Migne,* PL., xl. 487—518. [2] Ib., xl. 517—548. [3] Retract., i. 27.
[4] Ib., ii. 60. [5] *Migne,* PL., xl. 349—372. [6] Ib., xl. 611—626.
[7] Ib., xl. 373—396. [8] Ib., xl. 397—428. [9] Retract., ii. 22.
[10] Ib., ii. 23. [11] *Migne,* PL., xl. 429—450. [12] Ib., xl., 547—582.
[13] Retract, ii. 21. [14] *Migne,* PL., xl. 309—348; Retract., ii. 14.
[15] Retract., ii. 11. [16] *Migne,* PL., xxxviii—xxxix.

quorumdam qui adhuc desiderantur fragmenta, and: Sermones suppositii (1—317). Other discourses (Tractatus, Sermones) are found elsewhere in the Benedictine edition, among the correlated works of the Saint; we have already mentioned many of them among his apologetic, dogmatic, dogmatico-polemical and theologico-moral writings. Since the appearance of the Benedictine edition many new sermons of St. Augustine have been published, by Denis[1], Fontani[2], Frangipane[3], and others, but most of these are either unquestionably spurious or at least of very doubtful authenticity. Augustine is the foremost ecclesiastical orator of the patristic epoch, a judgment that accords perfectly with his personal appreciation of his worth: Mihi prope semper sermo meus displicet[4] He always seeks some better expression, one that is clearer and larger; the words just spoken always fail to convey his thoughts and emotions satisfactorily. We have compared elsewhere (§ 74, 11) the oratorical style of Augustine with that of Chrysostom. It may be added here that the earlier sermons of Augustine are more rhetorical and polished, while his later sermons excel in compactness of expression, logical power and unadorned simplicity. — His letters number two hundred and seventy in the second volume of the Benedictine edition; a fragment of a letter is published at the end of the third Benedictine volume[5]. Among these two hundred and seventy letters are fifty-three addressed to Augustine or some of his friends. It is also to be noted that letters of Augustine are scattered through the various volumes of the Benedictine edition (see nos. 6 7 9), as in the second (Benedictine) volume letters are found that Augustine himself made public as treatises[6]. Two letters unknown to the Benedictine editors were discovered and published by Abbot Gottfried von Göttweig († 1749)[7], and Goldbacher published lately two hitherto unknown letters of Augustine. His correspondence covers a period of more than forty years (386/387—429), and varies considerably in importance. It contains but few letters of a purely friendly or intimate character; most of the letters deal with philosophical and theological problems, and are usually direct replies to questions sent him; in other letters he appears as the Christian pastor, urging his correspondents to a higher moral life, or as their counsellor in matters of conscience, or again as their consoler in the hour of trial or misfortune, some of his letters are merely official communications, written in the name of synods, and often concerning the above-mentioned schisms and heresies. The Psalmus contra partem Donati has already been men-

[1] Ib., xlvi. 813—940. [2] Ib., xlvii. 1113—1140.
[3] Ib., xlvi. 939—1004. [4] De catech. rud., 2, 3.
[5] *Migne*, PL., xxxiii; cf. Ib., 751—752.
[6] Retract., ii. 31, apropos of Ep. 102.
[7] *Migne*, PL., xxxiii. 789—792 929—938.

tioned (no. 6) as a poetical effusion of Augustine; other small and insignificant metrical pieces have been preserved among his works.

11. REVIEW OF THE WORKS OF ST. AUGUSTINE. — None of the other Latin Fathers has left so many and so large works as Augustine; among the Greek Fathers only Chrysostom has contributed so much to ecclesiastical literature. Possidius, the earliest biographer of Augustine, says Tanta autem ab eodem dictata et edita sunt tantaque in ecclesia disputata, excepta atque emendata ., ut ea omnia vix quisquam studiosorum perlegere et nosse sufficiat[1] The style of Augustine is very attractive: he is unusually skilful and ready in the expression of his thoughts; he positively fascinates us by the ability with which he depicts the various thoughts and emotions of his soul. His latinity bears the impress of his own time; usually his diction is noble and choice, but in his popular sermons and works he condescends to use the language of the people. Thus in the Enarrationes in Psalmos he affects an average «barbarism» of speech, and expressly avoids the purism of the «grammarians»; here are his own words: Quid ad nos quid grammatici velint? Melius in barbarismo nostro vos intelligitis, quam in nostra disertitudine vos deserti estis[2]; potui illud dicere cum tracto vobis; saepe enim et verba non latina dico ut vos intelligatis[3]; melius est reprehendant nos grammatici quam non intelligant populi[4] In the Psalmus contra partem Donati he deliberately disregards all metrical laws that he may not be compelled to use words unfamiliar to the multitude[5]; the work De agone christiano was purposely written in the language of the people: humili sermone[6]. The versatility of Augustine is evident from the mere enumeration of the titles of his works; and we have also indicated, as occasion offered, their special value and bearing. These writings mirror a highly-gifted personality, a heart overflowing with the ardor of life and the warmth of love, a mind unparalleled for logical acuteness and speculative depth. If Jerome is rightly called the most erudite of the Fathers, Augustine is certainly the greatest, the most original and versatile. He unites at once the creative power of a Tertullian and the ecclesiastical sentiments of a Cyprian; we find in him the practical tact of the Latins and the intellectual vivacity of the Greeks; his mind is powerfully attracted to the obscure problems of theological anthropology, such as the relations of man to God, reparation and re-union, sin and grace. In this department of theology he towers above all others as an incomparable master. Nevertheless, he does not develop his ideas in any finished and rounded system. He tells us himself that the necessities of a ceaseless controversy induced, or rather forced him, constantly to develop

[1] Vita S. Aug., c. 18. [2] Enarr. in Ps. xxxvi sermo 3, 6.
[3] Ib., in Ps. cxxiii. 8. [4] Ib., in Ps. cxxxviii. 20.
[5] Retract, i. 20. [6] Ib., ii. 3.

and reform his opinions on individual questions: Ego proinde fateor me ex eorum numero esse conari, qui proficiendo scribunt et scribendo proficiunt[1]; proficienter me existimo Deo miserante scripsisse, non tamen a perfectione coepisse[2]. This is why he desires that his works should be read in the order in which they were written: Inveniet enim fortasse quomodo scribendo profecerim, quisquis opuscula mea ordine quo scripta sunt legerit[3] He demands likewise that his teachings should be gathered from his later rather than from his earlier writings. When the Semipelagians appealed to those earlier writings, he replied: Non sicut legere libros meos, ita etiam in eis curaverunt proficere mecum[4]. This just demand of our Saint was destined to be more than once ignored in the ages to come. It was but natural that a man like Augustine should irresistibly attract his contemporaries and exercise over them a very potent influence. His personal authority is evident from the collection of his letters; he seems to dominate the entire Church, or, at least, the entire African Church, and to guide at will the progressive spirit of his time. People living at a great distance take the liberty of sending him a multitude of questions and doubts: Tu me innumerabilium quaestionum turba repente circumvallandum vel potius obruendum putasti[5]. The world looked on him, in the words of a certain Audax, as an oracle of the law: oraculum legis[6], from whom it was possible to learn everything. Augustine judged of himself in another manner. He requests his correspondents not only to read him leniently, but also to criticise him frankly: In omnibus litteris meis non solum pium lectorem, sed etiam liberum correctorem desiderem[7] He asks them to follow him only when they are convinced that he has written the truth: Neminem velim sic amplecti omnia mea, ut me sequatur, nisi in iis in quibus me non errasse perspexerit[8]. In another work[9] he says: «the errors of this work are mine; to God, the giver of all good gifts, belongs what is true and pertinent therein» Posterity has ratified the judgment of his contemporaries; he still passes for one of those mighty spirits that appear only at great intervals of time, but are destined to influence very profoundly the destiny of humanity. He has earned from all later generations the title of a Second Paul, a *Doctor gratiae*. No Father of the Church has, even remotely, so magisterially affected the entire later course of philosophy and theology, as Augustine did. With princely generosity he scattered along his way ideas in which later thinkers found the materials for entire systems of doctrine; his words were often the origin of dogmatic controversies that have agitated powerfully more than one generation of mankind. Ecclesia-

[1] Ep. 143, 2. [2] De dono persev., xxi. 55. [3] Retract., Prol. 3.
[4] De praed. sanct., iv. 8. [5] Ep. 118, 1, 1. [6] Ep. 260.
[7] De trinit., iii; Prooem. 2. [8] De dono persev., xxi. 55.
[9] De vera religione, ix. 17.

stical authority, both conciliar and pontifical, has always reckoned him among the chief doctors of the Church; it has declared that particularly in the matters of divine grace, its nature, necessity and gratuitous character, his writings are a faithful reflection of the teachings of the Church. The decrees of the second Council of Orange (529), condemnatory of Semipelagianism, are nearly all taken verbally from the writings of Augustine or from the collections of pertinent «sententiae» extracted from his writings by Prosper of Aquitania (§ 95, 3); but it must be noted, however, that the Church has never made her own the entire teaching of Augustine concerning grace and predestination.

12. THE PHILOSOPHY OF ST. AUGUSTINE. — Augustine was a Platonist, as were most of the Christian thinkers of antiquity; his Platonism, however, was colored by the new religion and was filled with its spirit. In his eyes Plato is the foremost of all pre-Christian philosophers[1]. In the same place he declares Aristotle a: vir excellentis ingenii et eloquio Platoni quidem impar, sed multos facile superans[2]. Among the Neoplatonists he distinguishes Plotinus, Jamblichus, Porphyrius, and Apuleius[3]. It is the Platonists who came nearest to the true philosophy, which is that of Christianity: Nulli nobis, quam isti, propius accesserunt[4]. Seeking after God they rightly rose above the world of sense, above the soul and the changeful realm of spirits: Cuncta corpora transscenderunt quaerentes Deum omnem animam mutabilesque omnes spiritus transscenderunt quaerentes summum Deum[5]. — His Christian Platonism manifests itself particularly in his demonstration of the existence of God. He gives a great many proofs of this doctrine[6], sometimes from the external and visible world, its mutability and its order; sometimes from the nature of the human soul, the mutability of human intelligence, the voice of conscience, the desire of happiness; more frequently, however, and with evident predilection from certain original immutable truths natural to the soul of man. By these truths he understands those fundamental principles of reason or intelligence, the absolute necessity and universality of which show that they have not been derived a posteriori from human experience, but that they are dialectical, mathematical, ethical and æsthetic axioms, which dominate the human mind with luminous strength and imperious majesty· supreme and changeless rules, according to which we judge things to be true or false, good or bad, beautiful or ugly. From these truths Augustine concludes that God exists; it is true that he frequently seems to identify them with the divine essence itself. He often uses such phrases as the following: God is the light in which we see all immutable truths, God enlightens all minds, God is the innermost

[1] De civ. Dei, viii. 4 ff. [2] Ib., viii. 12. [3] Ib.
[4] Ib., viii. 5. [5] Ib., viii. 6. [6] Conf., x. 6—27 8—38.

teacher of the soul, and the like. These expressions easily lead the reader to suppose that our mental vision of these immutable truths is identical with the vision of the divine essence, though of course an imperfect vision; hence, we need not be surprised to learn that Augustine has often been quoted as a champion of Ontologism. In other places, however, our Saint has clearly distinguished between these ideal truths, and God as the real and original truth, he concludes from the truths innate in the human mind that God must exist as their first and essential foundation. He is, in fact, developing the argument of causality, and this particular demonstration is only his peculiar way of pressing the so-called cosmological proof of the existence of God. With the exception of Saint Bonaventure, that «Second Augustine», the Aristotelian scholastics have generally abandoned this argument of the bishop of Hippo. Nevertheless, he conceived in this way the existence of God and demonstrated that He was beyond all categories of the finite, or without quality or quantity or the like: sine qualitate bonum, sine quantitate magnum, sine indigentia creatorem, sine situ praesidentem, sine habitu omnia continentem, sine loco ubique totum, sine tempore sempiternum, sine ulla sui mutatione mutabilia facientem nihilque patientem[1]. God is, therefore, at once knowable and unknowable. Augustine avoids such Platonist and Neoplatonist expressions as super-being, super-life, super-reason etc. The finite is the result and the image of the ideas that illuminate the creative will of the Infinite Being. The Platonic ideas, therefore, according to Augustine, are identical with the creative ideas of God. At the same time he teaches that not only the general essences of things but also all particular things (real and possible) are ideally pre-existent in the mind of the Creator: Singula igitur propriis sunt creata rationibus rerum omnium creandarum creatarumve rationes in divina mente continentur[2]. — By faith in divine revelation there is opened to man a new world of knowledge, especially of the knowledge of God. In his later or post-baptismal writings, Augustine illustrates as follows the relations between faith and knowledge: Intellige ut credas, crede ut intelligas[3]; alia sunt enim quae nisi intelligamus non credimus, et alia sunt quae nisi credamus non intelligimus; proficit ergo noster intellectus ad intelligenda quae credat, et fides proficit ad credenda quae intelligat[4]. In one way knowledge precedes faith, our reason must not only furnish us the images and concepts through which we grasp and understand the truths of divine revelation[5], but must also furnish us with knowledge of the objective reality of the latter: Nostrum est considerare quibus vel hominibus vel libris credendum sit[6]. Faith

[1] De trinit., v. 1, 2. [2] De div. quaest. lxxxiii, qu. xlvi. 2.
[3] Sermo xliii. 7, 9. [4] Enarr. in Ps cxviii, sermo xviii. 3.
[5] De trinit., viii. 4—5 6—8. [6] De vera relig. 25, 46.

is an acquiescence in thoughts that we have previously entertained: Nullus quippe credit aliquid, nisi prius cogitaverit esse credendum ipsum credere nihil aliud est quam cum assensione cogitare[1] The motives of this assent are found by reason in the contents of divine revelation, especially in its miracles and prophecies[2]. But once we have grasped by faith the truths of revelation, our reason craves a deeper intelligence, a more personal comprehension of them. And in this way faith precedes knowledge, as the prophet had foretold: Nisi credideritis, non intelligetis[3]. In the future life this knowledge will become the beatific vision: Illa visio facie ad faciem liberatis in resurrectione servatur[4].

13. THEOLOGY OF ST. AUGUSTINE. REFUTATION OF PELAGIANISM. — In his conflict with Pelagian naturalism, Augustine was called on to defend the fundamental truths of Christianity, viz. that in creating man, God had raised him to a supernatural end and endowed him accordingly with the gifts of supernatural grace. Among such gifts of the original state he reckons immortality (*posse non mori* as distinguished from *non posse mori*), freedom from the disorders of concupiscence (concupiscentia rebellis), sanctity and justice or that supernatural likeness to God which fallen man received again by means of sanctifying grace: Hanc imaginem in spiritu mentis impressam perdidit Adam per peccatum, quam recipimus per gratiam iustitiae[5] Adam, indeed, might have persevered in this state of grace, not in and by his free will, but by means of the actual grace which God had promised him: Primo itaque homini datum est adiutorium perseverantiae non quo fieret ut perseveraret, sed sine quo per liberum arbitrium perseverare non posset[6] But as a consequence of his sin Adam lost the supernatural gifts of his original state, was deeply wounded in all the natural and moral forces of his being, and became liable to eternal damnation. The posterity of our first father inherited his sin with all its consequences and punishment, so that all mankind is a *massa perditionis, damnabilis et damnata.* This hereditary character of original sin is explained by St. Augustine, after St. Paul, as a consequence of Adam's office as the head and the representative of the human race[7]. He does not undertake to explain the manner in which original sin is handed down. The Pe-

[1] De praed. sanctorum ii. 5.

[2] De vera relig. 25, 46—47; De utilit. credendi 16—17 34—35.

[3] Is. vii. 9 (Septuagint); Ep. cxx. 1, 3; Sermo xliii. 6, 7; Enarr. in Ps. cxviii sermo xviii. 3.

[4] Enarr. in Ps. xliii. 5. [5] De Gen. ad lit. vi. 27, 38.

[6] De corr. et grat. 12, 34.

[7] He understands the «in quo» of Rom. v. 12 to mean «in Adamo»; cf. Contra Iul., i. 3, 10, and Opus imperfect. c. Iul. i. 47, where he quotes approvingly a text from St. Ambrose (Comm. in Lk. vii. 234): Fuit Adam et in illo fuimus omnes, periit Adam et in illo omnes perierunt.

lagians argued that such a propagation of sin was impossible: sin, they said, was not inherent in the body, but in the soul, and the soul was created by God. It was very probably in deference to this objection that Augustine abstained from pronouncing definitely against generationism, and in favor of creationism. By the act of generation, he replied, either there is propagated together with the body a soul contaminated by sin, or the soul, though created by God, is infected with in the corruption of sin by reason of its union with the body[1]. But this presupposed *vitiatio carnis* is occasioned and brought about by sinful concupiscence in the act of generation[2]. It is in consequence of these principles that, when Augustine describes the state of fallen man, he is wont to bring forward in the first place the corruption of human nature and its unruly concupiscence. He has not yet made it clear that the essence of original sin is to be found in the loss of the afore-mentioned supernatural likeness to God. On the other hand, he loves to depict both the corruption of human nature and the corrupting influence of an evil concupiscence, all the more as the Pelagians denied not only the existence of original sin, but all consequences thereof as regards human nature. The reformers of the sixteenth century, likewise Baius and Jansenius, appealed willingly to the authority of Augustine in favor of their doctrine concerning the absolute extinction or absence of all natural moral power in man. However Augustine always proclaims, and with energy, that fallen man still possesses free will, or the power of choice in the moral order: liberum arbitrium[3]. Though fallen, and groaning beneath the yoke of concupiscence, the not yet justified man cannot only desire what is good, but can also perform something good, praiseworthy and meritorious[4]. It is true that in his later writings, we come with increasing frequency on apparently contradictory statements, e. g. that the infidel can do nothing good, that the externally good works of the infidels are really sins[5]. The context shows, however, that in such phrases he has in view works that are supernaturally good, meritorious of salvation. Augustine takes it for granted that even in his fallen state man is destined to a supernatural end, and that he ought to direct thereto all his moral activity; this end, however, can be known to him only by faith, and he can reach it only by the grace of the Redeemeer which comes through faith. Hence, the works of the infidels are sins in the sense that they are not performed with a proper intention: Homines sine fide non ad eum finem ista opera retulerunt, ad quem referre debue-

[1] Contra Iul., v. 4, 17. [2] De nupt. et concup., i. 24, 27.

[3] Contra duas epist. Pelag., i. 2, 5; ii. 5, 9.

[4] De spir. et litt. 27—28, 48.

[5] Contra duas epist. Pelag., iii. 5, 14; Contra Iul., iv. 3, 32; in both places with reference to Rom. xiv. 23: omne quod non est ex fide, peccatum est.

runt[1]; as regards the result, he admits no distinction between infidelity or the ignorance of our supernatural end that comes from personal guilt, and that infidelity which is the consequence of the guilt contracted by original sin: Et illa ignorantia quae non est eorum qui scire nolunt, sed eorum qui tamquam simpliciter nesciunt, neminem sic excusat ut sempiterno igne non ardeat[2]. — We have already seen that by justification man regains the supernatural likeness of God that he had lost by sin. In the naturalistic system of the Pelagians there was no place for the concept of an internal sanctifying grace. In the first of his Anti-Pelagian works[3], Augustine explains minutely and defends sanctifying grace as something that accomplishes a thorough change and renewal in man through the infusion of habitual love of God and the imparting of supernatural strength. By this grace man obtains the true freedom of his will, i. e. the moral strength necessary to perform supernaturally good acts, *libertas* as distinguished from *liberum arbitrium:* Voluntas quippe humana non libertate consequitur gratiam sed gratia potius libertatem[4]. It is the love of God that renders our human acts truly good, i. e. deserving of eternal happiness: Quid autem boni faceremus nisi diligeremus? aut quomodo bonum non facimus si diligamus?[5] It is through actual grace that man obtains habitual grace with perseverance in the same and the proper use of it. Without this aid man can neither will nor perform any (supernatural) good: nisi ipsa voluntas hominis Dei gratia fuerit liberata et ad omne bonum actionis, sermonis, cogitationis adiuta[6]; ipse ut velimus operatur incipiens, qui volentibus cooperatur perficiens[7] The merits of the Saints are the gifts of divine grace: non gratia ex merito, sed meritum ex gratia[8]; ipsum hominis meritum donum est gratuitum[9]. In His elect God crowns His own gifts: Dona sua coronat, non merita tua coronat autem in nobis Deus dona misericordiae suae[10]. In his earlier writings Augustine had limited much more closely the influence and necessity of actual grace. In order to correct or explain his inexact assertions he repeats frequently in the Retractationes that it is truly man who wishes to do good, but that it is God who gives him the will to do good, according to the word of Scripture: Praeparatur voluntas a Domino[11]. In his Expositio quarumdam proposit. ex epist. ad Rom. our Saint had put forth the theory that faith is the work of man and not the gift of God: Fidem, qua in Deum credimus, non esse donum Dei, sed a nobis esse in nobis[12]; but he soon corrected this theory tacitly[13],

[1] Contra Iul., iv. 3, 25. [2] De gratia et lib. arb. 3, 5.
[3] De pecc. mer. et rem. lib. 1. [4] De corr. et grat. 8, 17.
[5] De grat. Chr. 26, 27. [6] Contra duas epist. Pelag., ii. 5, 9.
[7] De gratia et lib. arb. 17, 33. [8] Sermo 169, 2, 3.
[9] Ep. 186, 3, 10. [10] In Io. ev. tract. 3, 10.
[11] Prov. viii. 35 (Septuagint); Retract., i. 9, 2; i. 10, 2; i. 22, 4; ii. 1, 2.
[12] De praed. sanct. 3, 7. [13] De div. quaest. ad Simplic. i, qu. 2.

and at a later date withdrew it formally[1]. He believed that for the first time in De correptione et gratia he had taught positively and clearly, that perseverance in grace was a gift of God: Donum Dei esse etiam perseverare usque in finem[2]. Similarly, he looked on his theory of predestination as a consequence of his conflict with Pelagianism, and particularly with the assertion of the Pelagians: Gratiam Dei secundum merita nostra dari[3]. Predestination, he says, is the eternal design of God to lead certain men to eternal life by infallibly efficacious graces: Haec est praedestinatio sanctorum, nihil aliud: praescientia scilicet et praeparatio beneficiorum Dei, quibus certissime liberantur quicumque liberantur[4]; praedestinasse est hoc praescisse quod fuerat ipse facturus[5]. No one has any right to be withdrawn from the *massa perditionis*, and whoever is withdrawn therefrom owes it entirely to the gratuitous grace of God. It is without any regard for the merits of the elect that God saves some from eternal damnation and predestines them to eternal life: Sola enim gratia redemptos discernit a perditis[6]; liberantur gratuita miseratione, non debita, quos elegit ante constitutionem mundi per electionem gratiae, non ex operibus vel praeteritis vel praesentibus vel futuris. Alioquin gratia iam non est gratia. Quod maxime apparet in parvulis[7]. All the non-elect are, or rather remain, the prey of eternal damnation. But does not the Apostle say[8] that God will have all men to be saved? This difficult text, says Augustine, must be so explained that it shall not conflict with the evident truth that whatever God wills is sure to happen[9]. Perhaps the Apostle means that no one is saved if God does not will it[10]; perhaps by «all men» we are to understand all classes of men: omne genus humanum per quascumque differentias distributum, reges, privatos[11]; perhaps he means that we ought to be ready to aid all men in the matter of their salvation[12]. After the year 417 Augustine seems no longer to admit that God gives to every one grace sufficient for salvation[13]. This is no doubt the reason why he no longer insists on the nature of the efficacious grace reserved to the elect (adiutorium quo), nor on its relation to the merely sufficient grace (adiutorium sine quo non). He is content to emphasize the infallible results of efficacious grace, and loves to insist on the divine omnipotence as the secret of its irresistible operation. The idea of a divine will, omnipotent, supreme, the source of all goodness, sustains and dominates all his teaching concerning divine grace.

[1] Retract., i. 23, 2—4; De praed. sanct. 3, 7; 4, 8.
[2] De dono persev. 21, 55. [3] Ib., 20, 53. [4] Ib., 14, 35.
[5] Ib., 18, 47. [6] Enchir. 99, 25. [7] Contra Iul., vi. 19, 59.
[8] 1 Tim. ii. 4. [9] Enchir. 103, 27; Ep. 217, 6, 19.
[10] Enchir., l. c.; cf. Contra Iul., iv. 8, 44.
[11] Enchir., l. c.; De corr. et grat. 14, 44. [12] De corr. et grat. 15, 47, 46.
[13] Ep. 185, 11, 49; De corr. et grat. 11, 32.

14. COMPLETE EDITIONS. TRANSLATIONS. — The first complete editions of the works of Augustine were brought out by *J. Amerbach,* Basel, 1506, 9 vols. (reprinted Paris, 1515); *D. Erasmus,* Basel, 1528—1529, 10 vols. (often reprinted); *Theologi Lovanienses,* Antwerp, 1577, 11 vols. (often reprinted). The Oratorian *H. Vignier* published a valuable Supplementum operum S. Augustini, Paris, 1654—1655, 2 vols.; see *Schoenemann,* Bibl. hist.-lit. Patr. lat. ii. 65—70, 84—144. They were all surpassed by the edition of the Benedictines of St. Maur (*Th. Blampin, P. Coustant,* et al.); though the latter did not add many inedita, a far purer text of Augustine was presented by them, while they also separated very successfully the spurious material from the genuine, especially as regards the letters and the sermons. This edition appeared at Paris, 1679—1700, 11 vols., vol. i to iv and viii—x were reprinted at Paris, 1688—1696. With the exception of vol. iv. (Enarr. in Psalmos), each of the volumes i—x contains a specially paginated appendix in which are found the spuria and the adiecta. Vol. xi contains a very copious life of St. Augustine and a comprehensive Index in omnia opera S. Augustini. In the preparation of the Vita the Benedictine editors were able to use the manuscript biography of the Saint by Tillemont, published later in the latter's Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire ecclés. xiii., 2. ed., Paris, 1710. Very detailed Indices to the works of St. Augustine were published by the Dominican *D. Lenfant* in his Concordantiae Augustinianae, Paris, 1656—1665, 2 vols. Cf. *R. C. Kukula,* Die Mauriner Ausgabe des Augustinus (Sitzungsberichte der k. Akad. der Wissensch. zu Wien), Vienna, 1890, i—ii.; 1893, iii. 1; 1898, iii. 2; *O. Rottmanner,* Bibliographische Nachträge zu Dr. *R. C. Kukulas* Abhandlung: «Die Mauriner Ausgabe des Augustinus», in the same Sitzungsberichte, Vienna, 1891; *A. M. P. Ingold,* Histoire de l'édition Bénédictine de St. Augustin, Paris, 1903. The Benedictine edition was reprinted, apparently at Antwerp, but really at Amsterdam, 1700—1702, 11 vols.; in 1703 appeared (ib.) a twelfth volume entitled: Appendix Augustiniana by Phereponus (Jean le Clerc); it was also reprinted at Venice, 1729—1735, 11 vols.; 1756—1769, 18 vols.; 1797—1807, 18 vols.; 1833—1866, 11 vols.; another reprint was brought out at Paris, in 11 vols. (apud fratres *Gaume,* 1836—1839), and accurante *J. P. Migne,* Paris, 1845, 11 vols.; finally in PL. xxxii—xlvii. 1845—1849. A new and complete edition was undertaken in 1887 for the Corpus script. eccles. lat. of the Vienna Academy of Sciences, so far there have been edited the Speculum (*F. Weihrich,* vol. xii), most of the Anti-Manichæan works (*J. Zycha,* xxv. 1—2), several exegetical works (*Zycha,* xxviii. 1—3), several moral-theological works (*Zycha,* xli), the Confessiones (*P. Knöll,* xxxiii), a portion of the correspondence (*A. Goldbacher,* xxxiv. 1—2), the De civitate Dei (*E. Hoffmann,* xl) and various anti-Pelagian works (*C. F. Urba* and *J. Zycha,* xlii), the Retractiones (*P. Knöll,* xxxvi). The volumes edited by Zycha correspond but partially with the just demands of modern scholarship. — Ausgewählte Schriften des hl. Aurelius Augustinus, Kirchenlehrers, nach dem Urtexte übersetzt, Kempten, 1871—1879, 8 vols. (Bibl. der Kirchenväter): i: Confessiones by *J. Molzberger;* ii—iii: De civitate Dei by *U. Uhl;* iv: De doctrina christiana by *R. Storf,* De catechizandis rudibus by *Molzberger,* De symbolo ad catechumenos by *Storf,* De fide et operibus by *Storf,* Enchiridion ad Laurentium by *Molzberger;* v—vi: In Johannis evangelium tractatus cxxv by *H. Hayd;* vii—viii: Select letters by *Th. Kranzfelder.* There is an English translation of nearly all the works of St. Augustine, in the Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church, by *Ph. Schaff* (series I), Buffalo, 1886 ff.

15. SEPARATE EDITIONS. TRANSLATIONS. RECENSIONS. — *Retractationes and Confessiones, Philosophical works:* The Confessiones have often been printed separately. The edition of the Jesuits, *H. Sommalius* (Douai, 1607) and *H. Wagnereck* (Confessionum libri x priores, Dillingen, 1630) circulated widely. Later separate editions are owing to *K. v. Raumer,* Stuttgart, 1856, 2. ed., Gütersloh, 1876; *P. Knöll,* Leipzig, 1898. German translations were published by *W. Bornemann,* Gotha, 1889, (Bibl. theolog. Klassiker, vol. xii), and *O. F. Bachmann,* Leipzig. 1891. Cf. *A. Harnack,* Augustins Konfessionen, ein Vortrag, Giessen, 1888. 2. ed. 1894, 3. ed. 1903. *G. Boissier,* La fin du paganisme, Paris, i, 3. ed., 1903, pp. 291—325: «La conversion de St. Augustin.» The opinion of Harnack and Boissier that the account of Augustine's conversion, as told in the Confessions, is not entirely reliable, has been refuted by *Fr. Wörter,* Die Geistesentwicklung des hl. Aurelius Augustinus bis zu seiner Taufe, Paderborn, 1892, pp. 62—66, cf. *C. Douais,* Les Confessions de St. Augustin, Paris, 1893. — The philosophical works of St. Augustine are discussed by *Wörter,* l. c., 67—210 «Augustins litterarische Tätigkeit bis zu seiner Taufe.» *D. Ohlmann,* De S. Augustini dialogis in Cassiciaco scriptis (Diss. inaug.), Strassburg, 1897. For the Soliloquia cf. *Matinée,* S. Augustinus Aurelius in Soliloquiis qualis philosophus appareat, qualis vir (Thèse), Rennes, 1864. The spurious Soliloquia, Meditationes, Manuale, were often edited separately, especially by *H. Sommalius,* whose first edition of them appeared at Douai, 1613; reprinted by *E. W. Westhoff,* Münster, 1854. For Augustine's treatise on the seven liberal arts and its surviving fragments cf. *Teuffel-Schwabe,* Gesch. der röm. Litt., 5. ed., pp. 1132—1133. *W Ott,* Über die Schrift des hl. Augustinus «De magistro» (Progr.), Hechingen, 1898. — *Apologetic works:* Separate editions of the De civitate Dei were printed by *J. Strange,* Cologne, 1850, 2 vols., and by *B. Dombart,* Leipzig, 1863, 2 vols.; 2. ed. 1877. *G. J. Seyrich,* Die Geschichtsphilosophie Augustins nach seiner Schrift «De civitate Dei» (Inaug.-Diss.), Leipzig, 1891. *G. Boissier,* La fin du paganisme, Paris, 3. ed. 1903, ii. 293—337: La «Cité de Dieu» de St. Augustin. *C. Frick,* Die Quellen Augustins im xviii. Buche seiner Schrift «De civitate Dei» (Progr.), Höxter, 1886. *J. Dräseke,* Zu Augustins «De civitate Dei» xviii. 42, eine Quellenuntersuchung, in Zeitschr. f. wissenschaftl. Theol. (1889), xxxii. 230—248. *J. Biegler,* Die «Civitas Dei» des hl. Augustinus, Paderborn, 1894. *E. Hoffmann,* Zu Augustins «De civitate Dei», textkritische Epilegomena zur Ausgabe im Wiener Corpus, in Sitzungsberichte, Vienna, 1900. *H. Kuhlmann,* De veterum historicorum in Augustini De civitate Dei libro primo, altero, tertio vestigiis (Progr.), Schleswig, 1900. — *Dogmatic works:* The Enchiridion ad Laurentium was also often edited separately; one of the oldest and best editions, with copious notes, is that of the Jesuit *J. B. Faure,* Rome, 1755, reprint by *C. Passaglia,* Naples, 1847. The latest edition, and textually the most critical is that of *J. G. Krabinger,* Tübingen, 1861. It is also in *Hurter,* SS. Patr. opusc. sel. xvi (vol. vi. has De fide et symbolo, and De fide rerum quae non videntur; vols. xlii—xliii contain De trinitate). A new edition of the Enchiridion was published by *O. Scheel,* Tübingen, 1903.

16. SEPARATE EDITIONS. TRANSLATIONS. RECENSIONS (CONTINUED). — *Dogmatico-polemical works:* A reprint of the Benedictine edition of De haeresibus is found in *Fr. Oehler,* Corpus haereseologicum, Berlin, 1856, i. 187—225. — *Anti-Manichæan works:* Most of them were newly edited by *Zycha* (see no. 14) together with the (supposed) work of bishop Evodius; concerning the correspondence of Evodius with our Saint see *Bardenhewer,* in the Kirchenlexicon of Wetzer and Welte (2. ed.) iv. 1061. In Revue Bénéd. (1896), xiii. 481—486, *Dom Morin* published a new letter of Evodius. For

the history of the Manichæans of Augustine's time see *A. Bruckner,* Faustus von Mileve. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des abendländischen Manichäismus, Basel, 1901. — *Anti-Donatist works:* In Hurter (SS. Patr. opusc. sel. xxvii) are reprinted S. Augustini opuscula selecta de ecclesia. For a general account of the anti-Donatist writings of our Saint see *F. Ribbeck,* Donatus und Augustinus oder der erste entscheidende Kampf zwischen Separatismus und Kirche, Elberfeld, 1857—1858, 2 parts. For the Psalmus contra partem Donati, the oldest monument of Latin rhythmic poetry, see *W. Meyer,* in Abhandlungen der k. bayer. Akad. der Wissensch. I. Kl., vol. xvii, part II, Munich, 1885, pp. 284—288. On the pretended Liber testimoniorum fidei contra Donatistas, in *Pitra,* Analecta sacra et classica, Paris, 1888, part I, pp. 147—158, see § 111, 3. — *Anti-Pelagian works:* In Hurter (l. c. xxxv xxxvi) are found S. Augustini et S. Prosp. Aquit. de gratia opusc. sel. Urba and Zycha have edited (see no. 14): De perfectione hominis, De gestis Pelagii, De gratia Christi et de peccato originali libri duo, De nuptiis et concupiscentia ad Valerium comitem libri duo. For a general study of his anti-Pelagian writings, see *G. Fr. Wiggers,* Versuch einer pragmatischen Darstellung des Augustinismus und Pelagianismus nach ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung (new ed.), Hamburg, 1833, 2 vols. For the history of Pelagianism see *Fr. Wörter,* Der Pelagianismus nach seinem Ursprunge und seiner Lehre, Freiburg i. Br., 1866; 2. ed. 1874. *Fr. Klasen,* Die innere Entwicklung des Pelagianismus, Freiburg i. Br., 1882. *J. Ernst,* Pelagianische Studien. Kritische Randbemerkungen zu Klasen und Wörter, in Katholik 1884, ii. 225—259, 1885, i. 241—269. Of the rather numerous writings of Pelagius some have been preserved: Commentarii in epistolas S. Pauli (*Migne,* PL., xxx. 645—902), an important exegetical work, and Epistola ad Demetriadem, written about 412—413 (Ib., xxx. 15—45, and xxxiii. 1099—1120); it was translated into Italian and attributed to St. Jerome by the Dominican *Zanobi,* Naples, 1863. Pelagius wrote also a Libellus Fidei ad Innocentium papam, in 417 (Ib. xlv. 1716—1718 and xlviii. 488—491). The origin of the Epistola ad Celantiam matronam (Ib. xxii. 1204—1220) is still doubtful. In Theol. Quartalschr. (1885) lxvii. 244—317 531—577, *Fr. Klasen* denied the Pelagian authorship of the Commentaries on the Pauline epistles. In their anti-Pelagian works Jerome, Augustine and Marius Mercator quoted more or less extensively texts from other works of Pelagius: Eulogiarum (also capitulorum and testimoniorum?) liber, De natura, De libero arbitrio, and several letters. Other works are known only by name, e. g. De trinitate libri tres. For further details see *Schoenemann,* Bibl. hist.-litt. Patr. lat. ii. 433—436; *Bähr,* Gesch. der röm. Litteratur, Supplement, (1836—1840), ii. 310—314. The text of the Commentarii of Pelagius in Migne (l. c.) is not the original; for its sources see the valuable work of *H. Zimmer,* Pelagius in Irland. Texte und Untersuchungen zur patristischen Litteratur, Berlin, 1902. Caelestius was probably neither British or Scot, nor Irish, but Italian. Apart from the quotations found in Augustine, his works Contra traducem peccati, Definitiones, Libelli fidei, and others have perished. J. Garnier († 1681) attempted to put together the full text of Definitiones from their refutation by St. Augustine, also a Libellus fidei to Pope Zosimus; cf. *Schoenemann,* l. c., ii. 470—472. The two principal works of Julianus of Eclanum: Libri iv ad Turbantium and Libri viii ad Florum, can be reconstructed in large measure from their refutations by Augustine. For unimportant fragments of other works of Julianus see *Schoenemann,* l. c., ii. 574 ff. Cf. *A. Bruckner,* Julian von Eclanum, sein Leben und seine Lehre, Leipzig, 1897, in Texte und Untersuchungen, xv. 3. Anianus, the Latin translator of Chrysostom, appeared as a defender of Pelagianism and an opponent of Jerome

(§ 74, 14). A Corpus Pelagianum, containing two unaddressed letters, a treatise De divitiis, and three letters De malis doctoribus et operibus fidei et de iudicio futuro, De possibilitate non peccandi, and De castitate, was edited by *C. P Caspari:* Briefe, Abhandlungen und Predigten aus den zwei letzten Jahrhunderten des kirchlichen Altertums und dem Anfang des Mittelalters, Christiania, 1890, pp. 1—67. All the documents of this collection are clearly Pelagian, belong to one and the same British author, and must have appeared between 413 and 430. *Caspari* (l. c., pp. 223—389) thinks he is the Pelagian Agricola mentioned by Prosper in his Chronicle ad a. 429: Mon. Germ. hist. Auct. Antiq. ix 1, 472, but *G. Morin,* in Revue Bénéd., 1898, xv. 481—493 (cf. *Künstle,* in Theol. Quartalschr. 1900, lxxxii. 193—204) thinks that these works were written by the British bishop Fastidius, of whom Gennadius says (De viris ill., c. 56) that he wrote a work De vita christiania, and another De viduitate servanda; *Morin* is of opinion that the De vita christiana is identical with the first work in the *Caspari* collection, while the second work of Fastidius has been lost. Following an ancient conjecture, *Caspari* (l. c., pp. 352—375) identified the De vita christiana of Fastidius with the pseudo-Augustinian De vita christiana (*Migne,* PL. ,xl. 1031—1046 and l. 383—402). The Epistola Fastidii Britannici episc. ad Fatalem, in *Pitra,* Analecta sacra et classica, Paris, 1888, part I, 134—136, is a bold plagiarism from the pseudo-Hieronymian letter Ad Pamm. et Oc. (*Migne,* xxx. 239—242). *J. Baer,* De operibus Fastidii Britannorum episcopi, Nürnberg, 1902, shows the identity of the Pelagian treatise edited by *Caspari* with the De vita christiana; as Fastidius certainly wrote the former, he must also be the author of the latter.

17. SEPARATE EDITIONS. TRANSLATIONS, RECENSIONS (CONTINUED). — *Exegetical works:* Several exegetical works of Augustine were newly edited by Zycha (see no. 14). The one hundred and twenty-four homilies on the Gospel of John are printed in Hurter's Opuscula selecta (series ii. 1—2). For no. 102 of the pseudo-Augustinian Quaestiones Veteris et Novi Testamenti (Contra Novatianum) see *A. Harnack* in Abhandlungen, Al. v. Öttingen gewidmet, Munich, 1898, pp. 54—93. *A. Souter,* An Unknown Fragment of the pseudo-Augustinian Quaestiones Veteris Testamenti, in Journal of Theol. Studies (1904), vi. 61—66. On the exegetical writings of Augustine in general cf. *H. N. Clausen,* Aurelius Augustinus Hipponensis S. Scripturae interpres, Kopenhagen, 1827. *C. Douais,* St. Augustin et la Bible, in Revue Biblique (1893), ii. 62—81 351—377; (1894), iii. 110—135 410 to 432. Concerning his ignorance of Hebrew the reader may consult *O. Rottmanner,* in Theol. Quartalschr. (1895), lxxvii. 269—276. *Id.,* St. Augustin sur l'auteur de l'épître aux Hébreux, in Revue Bénéd. (1901), xviii. 257—261. *Id.,* Augustinus als Exeget, in Bibl. Zeitschr. (1904), pp. 398—399. *Sancti Aureli Augustini* De consensu Evangelistarum libri quattuor. Recensuit et commentario critico instruxit Franciscus Weihrich (Corpus scriptorum eccles. latinorum, vol. xxxiii), Vienna, 1904. *R. C. Trench,* S. Augustine on the Sermon on the Mount, Dublin, several editions; Die Erklärung der Bergpredigt aus den Schriften des hl. Augustinus, deutsch von E. Roller, Neukirchen, 1904. — *Works on Moral and Pastoral Theology.* We owe to *Weihrich* (see no. 14) new editions of the genuine Speculum (Quis ignorat) and the spurious Speculum (Audi Israhel); other works of Augustine on moral theology were edited by *Zycha;* cf. *F Weihrich,* Das Speculum des hl. Augustinus und seine handschriftliche Überlieferung, in Sitzungsberichte der kgl. Akad. der Wissensch. zu Wien, Vienna, 1883. *Id.,* Die Bibelexcerpte De divinis scripturis und die Itala des hl. Augustinus, in the same Sitzungsberichte, Vienna, 1893. *L. Delisle,* Le plus ancien manuscrit du Miroir de St. Augustin (Extrait de la Bibl.

de l'Ecole des Chartes), Paris, 1884, differs from *Weihrich* and maintains the genuineness of Audi Israhel. For the works De mendacio and Contra mendacium see *E. Récéjac,* De mendacio quid senserit Augustinus, Paris, 1897. The De catechizandis rudibus is found in *Hurter,* Ss. Patr. opusc. sel. (series I), viii, and in *A. Wolfhard* and *G. Krüger*, Sammlung ausgewählter kirchen- und dogmengeschichtl. Quellenschriften, fasc. iv, Freiburg i. Br., 1892, 2. ed., 1893. *F. X. Schöberl*, Die «Narratio» des hl. Augustin und die Katechetiker der Neuzeit, Dingolfing, 1880. *P. Reutschka,* Die Dekalogkatechese des hl. Augustinus (Diss.), Breslau, 1904. — *Sermons. Letters. Poems:* The Augustini sermones inediti by *A. B. Caillau* (Paris, 1842) are nearly all spurious, cf. *Fessler-Jungmann,* Instit. Patrol., ii 1, 376, and *G. Morin,* in Revue Bénéd. (1893), x. 28—36. The Sermones S. Augustini ex codicibus Vaticanis, in *Mai,* Nova Patr. Bibl., Rome, 1852, i. part 1, 1—470, are also for the most part spurious; the same is true of the nine Homiliae or Sermones edited by *Fr. Liverani,* Spicilegium Liberianum, Florence, 1863, pp. 11—33. *C. P. Caspari* edited anew, in Alte und neue Quellen zur Geschichte des Taufsymbols und der Glaubensregel, Christiania, 1879, pp. 223—249, the Sermo 213, in traditione symboli 2 (*Migne,* PL., xxxviii. 1060—1065); its genuineness should never have been called in question; *Caspari* published also a Homilia de sacrilegiis, a spurious work, but remarkable for both contents and diction, on the survival of superstitions and pagan usages among Christians: Eine Augustin fälschlich beigelegte Homilia de sacrilegiis, Christiania, 1886. *Dom Morin* discovered and published, in Revue Bénédictine (1890), vii. 260—270 592; (1891), viii. 417—419; cf. (1892), ix. 173—177, two new and genuine sermons of Augustine: Sermo in vigil. S. Joh. Bapt. and Sermo in die S. Eulaliae; cf. *Morin,* Les sermons inédits de St. Augustin dans le manuscrit latin 17059 de Munich, in Revue Bénéd. (1893), x. 481—497 529 to 541. *A. Regnier*, La latinité des sermons de St. Augustin, Paris, 1887 *A. Degert,* Quid ad mores ingeniaque Afrorum cognoscenda conferant S. Augustini sermones (Thèse), Paris, 1894. Mention has already been made (see no. 14) of the new edition of the letters by *Goldbacher* who Wiener Studien (1894), xvi. 72—77 in described two newly found letters. In Revue Bénéd. (1901), xviii. 241—244, *Dom Morin* published a letter of St. Augustine and one of a certain Januarianus, both concerning the monastic troubles at Adrumetum. — For the poetry of St. Augustine see *M. Manitius,* Gesch. der christlich.-latein. Poesie, Stuttgart, 1891, pp. 320 to 323. According to *A. Ebner,* Handschriftliche Studien über das Praeconium paschale, in Kirchenmusikalisches Jahrbuch für das Jahr 1893, pp. 73—83, St. Augustine is the author of the paschal hymn Exultet; cf. *S. Pieralisi,* Il preconio pasquale conforme all' insigne frammento del Cod. Barberiniano. Dell' autore del piu antico preconio pasquale. Due dissert. Rome, 1883.

18. BIOGRAPHIES AND PORTRAITS. — We have already mentioned (no. 14) the two most important of the older biographies, that of Tillemont and that of the Benedictines (the latter in *Migne,* PL., xxxii. 65—578). Among more recent works the reader may consult *Fr. Böhringer,* Die Kirche Christi und ihre Zeugen oder die Kirchengeschichte in Biographien, Zürich, 1845, i 3, 99—774. *Fr.* und *P. Böhringer,* Aurelius Augustinus, Bischof von Hippo, Stuttgart, 1877—1878, 2 vols. (Die Kirche Christi und ihre Zeugen) new ed., xi, 1. and 2. half; *Poujoulat*, Histoire de St. Augustin, sa vie, ses œuvres, son siècle, influence de son génie, Paris, 1845—1846, 3 vols., 7. ed., 1886, 2 vols. This work was translated into German from the first edition by *Fr. Hurter,* Schaffhausen, 1846—1847, 2 vols. *C. Wolfsgruber,* Augustinus, Paderborn, 1898. *J. Martin,* St. Augustin, Paris, 1901 (Les grands philosophes). *A. Hatzfeld,* St. Augustin, 6. ed., Paris, 1901

(Les Saints). *G. Fr. v. Hertling,* Augustin. Der Untergang der antiken Kultur (Weltgeschichte in Charakterbildern), Mainz, 1901. *H. A. Naville,* St. Augustin. Etude sur le développement de sa pensée jusqu'à l'époque de son ordination, Geneva, 1872. *Fr. Wörter,* Die Geistesentwicklung des hl. Aurelius Augustinus bis zu seiner Taufe, Paderborn, 1892. *Flottes,* Etudes sur St. Augustin, son génie, son âme, sa philosophie, Montpellier, 1861. *W. Cunningham,* St. Austin and his place in the history of Christian thought, London, 1886. *J. McCabe,* Saint Augustine and his Age, London, 1902. *E. Portalié,* Le rôle doctrinal de Saint Augustin, in Bulletin de littérature ecclésiastique (1903), pp. 33—37. *Ph. Martain,* Saint Augustin et Saint Paulin de Nole. I. Premières relations. Une âme à sauver. II. Colloques ascétiques. En face de l'origénisme. III. Nôle en 410. Correspondence scripturaire. IV En face du pélagianisme: Revue Augustinienne (1904), pp. 120—131 266—287 368 383 576—596. *Herm. Frankfurth,* Augustin und die Synode zu Diospolis, Berlin, 1904.

19. WORKS ON THE PHILOSOPHY OF ST. AUGUSTINE. — *J. F. Nourrisson,* La philosophie de St. Augustin, Paris, 1865, 2 vols., 2. ed., 1869. *J. Storz,* Die Philosophie des hl. Augustinus, Freiburg i. Br., 1882. *L. Grandgeorge,* St. Augustin et le néoplatonisme, Paris, 1896 For his teaching concerning cognition see *N. J. L. Schütz,* Divi Augustini de origine et via cognitionis intellectualis doctrina ab ontologismi nota vindicata (Diss. inaug.), Münster, 1867. *J. Hähnel,* Verhältnis des Glaubens zum Wissen bei Augustin (Inaug.-Diss.), Leipzig, 1891. *H. Leder,* Untersuchungen über Augustins Erkenntnistheorie in ihren Beziehungen zur antiken Skepsis, zu Plotin und zu Descartes (Dissert.), Marburg, 1901. For a discussion of his ideas on metaphysics see *C. van Endert,* Der Gottesbeweis in der patristischen Zeit mit besonderer Berücksichtigung Augustins, Freiburg i. Br., 1869. *K. Scipio,* Des Aurelius Augustinus Metaphysik im Rahmen seiner Lehre vom Übel, Leipzig, 1886. *E. Melzer,* Die Augustinische Lehre vom Kausalitätsverhältnis Gottes zur Welt, Neisse, 1892. His psychological ideas are discussed by *Th. Gangauf,* Metaphysische Psychologie des hl. Augustinus, Augsburg, 1852. *W. Heinzelmann,* Augustins Lehre vom Wesen und Ursprung der menschlichen Seele (Progr.), Halberstadt, 1868; *Id.,* Augustins Lehre von der Unsterblichkeit und Immaterialität der menschlichen Seele (Inaug.-Diss.), Jena, 1874. *J. Martin,* La doctrine spirituelle de St. Augustin, Paris, 1901. *K. Werner,* Die Augustinische Psychologie in ihrer mittelalterlich-scholastischen Einkleidung und Gestaltung (Sitzungsberichte der kgl. Akad. der Wissensch. zu Wien), Vienna, 1882. *F. Kolde,* Das Staatsideal des Mittelalters, I. part: Seine Grundlegung durch Augustin (Progr.), Berlin, 1902. His æsthetical teachings are treated by *A. Berthaud,* S. Augustini doctrina de pulchro ingenuisque artibus e variis illius operibus excerpta, Poitiers, 1891. *P Martain,* Les fondements philosophiques de l'harmonie d'après St. Augustin, in Revue Augustinienne (1902), pp. 529 to 543. *E. Nardelli,* Il determinismo nella filosofia di sant' Agostino, Turin, 1905, pp. x—212.

20. WORKS ON THE THEOLOGY OF ST. AUGUSTINE. — Among modern writers the reader may consult *A. Dorner,* Augustinus, sein theologisches System und seine religionsphilosophische Anschauung, Berlin, 1873. *Th. Gangauf,* Des hl. Augustinus spekulative Lehre von Gott dem Dreieinigen, Augsburg, 1865, 2. ed. 1883. *A. Ritschl,* Expositio doctrinae Augustini de creatione mundi, peccato, gratia (Diss. inaug.), Halle, 1843. *Fr Grassmann,* Die Schöpfungslehre des hl. Augustinus und Darwins, Ratisbon, 1889. *Fr. Nitsch,* Augustinus' Lehre vom Wunder, Berlin, 1865. *J. Nirschl,* Ursprung und Wesen des Bösen nach der Lehre des hl. Augustinus, Ratisbon, 1854. *J. Ernst,* Die Werke und Tugenden der Ungläubigen

nach St. Augustin, Freiburg i. Br., 1871; *Id.*, in Zeitschr. f. kath. Theol. (1895), xix. 177—185. *F. P. Baltzer*, Des hl. Augustinus Lehre über Prädestination und Reprobation, Vienna, 1871. *A. Kock*, Die Auktorität des hl. Augustin in der Lehre von der Gnade und Prädestination, in Theol. Quartalschr. (1891), lxxiii. 95—136 287—304 455—487. Fr. *M. Jaquin*, O. P., La question de la prédestination aux V^e^ et VI^e^ siècles: Saint Augustin, in Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique (1904). pp. 265—283 725—754. *O. Rottmanner*, Der Augustinismus (i. e. his doctrine on predestination), Munich, 1892. Cf. *Schanz*, in Theol. Quartalschr. (1893), lxxv. 699—703, and Die Lehre des hl. Augustin über die Rechtfertigung, ib. (1901), lxxxiii. 481 to 528. *F. Turmel*, Le dogme du péché originel dans St. Augustin, in Revue d'hist. et de littér. relig. (1901), vi. 235—258 385—426, and (1892), vii. 128—146 209—230. *A. Kranich*, Über die Empfänglichkeit der menschlichen Natur für die Güter der übernatürl. Ordnung nach der Lehre des hl. Augustin und des hl. Thomas von Aquin, Paderborn, 1892. *Th. Specht*, Die Lehre von der Kirche nach dem hl. Augustin, Paderborn, 1892. The teaching of Augustine concerning the Church is also the subject of the Augustinian studies of *H. Reuter*, Gotha, 1887. *Th. Specht*, Die Einheit der Kirche nach dem hl. Augustinus (Progr.), Neuburg a. D., 1885. *E. Commer*, Die Katholizität nach dem hl. Augustinus, Breslau, 1873. *O. Rottmanner*, «Catholica», in Revue Bénéd. (1900), xvii. 1—9. *M. M. Wilden*, Die Lehre des hl. Augustinus vom Opfer der Eucharistie, Schaffhausen, 1864. *Schanz*, Die Lehre des hl. Augustinus über das heilige Sakrament der Buße, in Theol. Quartalschr. (1895), lxxvii. 448—496 598 to 621; *Id.*, Die Lehre des hl. Augustinus über die Eucharistie, ib. (1896), lxxviii. 79—115. *L. Tarchier*, Le sacrement de l'Eucharistie d'après S. Augustin (Thèse), Lyons, 1904. *O. Scheel*, Die Anschauung Augustins über Christi Person und Werke, Tübingen, 1901; Kiel, 1902. *E. Herzog*, Die kirchliche Sündenvergebung nach der Lehre des hl. Augustin, Bern, 1902. *F. Ernst*, Der hl. Augustin über die Entscheidung der Ketzertauffrage durch ein Plenarkonzil, in Zeitschr. für kath. Theol. (1900), xxiv. 282 f. *S. Protin*, La Mariologie de St. Augustin, in Revue Augustinienne (1902), pp. 375—396. *F. Blachère*, St. Augustin et les théophanies dans l'ancien Testament, ib., pp. 595—613. *E. Nourry*, Le miracle d'après St. Augustin, in Annales de la philosophie chrétienne (1903), pp. 375—386. *E. Portalié*, St. Augustin, in Dictionnaire de Théol. catholique, Paris, 1903, col. 2268—2561.

### § 95. Friends and disciples of St. Augustine.

1. MARIUS MERCATOR. — This writer was certainly not a native of Italy (Garnier) but of Africa (Gerberon, Baluze). From a letter of St. Augustine[1] we gather that about 418 and probably from Rome, Mercator submitted to the judgment of the bishop of Hippo two anti-Pelagian works. In 429 Mercator was at Constantinople and very probably resided there during the next twenty years. It is also probable that he survived the Council of Chalcedon (451). He remained a layman, or at least was never ordained to the priesthood; nevertheless he took an active part in the conflict with Pelagianism and Nestorianism as a defender of the teachings of St. Augustine and St. Cyril of Alexandria. His anti-Pelagian writings mentioned by

[1] Ep. 193.

St. Augustine[1] have perished, though some scholars have identified the second of them: librum refertum sanctarum testimoniis scripturarum[2], with the Hypomnesticon contra Pelagianos et Caelestianos printed among the Opera S. Augustini[3]. A Commonitorium super nomine Caelestii, written in Greek in 429 and re-edited in a Latin translation in 431, is extant in Latin[4]. There is also extant a Latin Commonitorium or Adversus haeresim Pelagii et Caelestii vel etiam scripta Juliani, written in 431 or 432[5]. The first memorial was presented by its author to Theodosius II. and contributed in no small degree to the expulsion (429) of the chiefs of the Pelagian heresy from Constantinople whither they had gone after their compulsory departure from Italy; it helped also to bring about their condemnation at the Council of Ephesus (431). Mercator wrote also, early in 431, two other Latin works against Nestorianism: Comparatio dogmatum Pauli Samosateni et Nestorii[6], and: Nestorii blasphemiarum capitula[7]; they are a refutation of the twelve counter-anathematisms of Nestorius with which he had attempted to combat the famous theses of St. Cyril (§ 77, 2). Mercator translated from Greek into Latin a number of large works; indeed, his translations are more numerous than his original writings. He not only prepared translations of anti-heretical works (those of Nestorius against Pelagianism and of Cyril against Nestorianism), but he also put into Latin many works and discourses of the Greek heresiarchs themselves (Theodore of Mopsuestia, Nestorius, and others). His purpose is expressed in the following words taken from the preface to a collection of excerpta from the writings of Theodore of Mopsuestia: Verbum de verbo transferre conatus sum, pravum eius sensum latinis volens auribus insinuare, cavendum modis omnibus, non sequendum[8]. Similarly in the preface to the homilies and works of the «impious Nestorius» he writes: Blasphemiarum dicta vel scripta curavi transferre, a fidelibus linguae meae fratribus cognoscenda atque vitanda, in quibus verbum de verbo, in quantum fieri potuit, conatus sum translator exprimere[9]. Many documents that have perished in the original Greek have been saved through the Latin versions of Mercator. His own works, though of inferior literary value, are very important for the history of the Pelagian and Nestorian controversies.

A complete edition of the works of Mercator was brought out at Paris, 1673, by *J. Garnier;* the text is not reliable, but copious *castigationes, notae* and *dissertationes* are added. *Etienne Baluze* also edited the works of Mercator, Paris, 1684. The Baluze edition is reprinted with some corrections in *Gallandi,* Bibl. vet. Patr., Venice, 1772, viii. 613—738; that of *Garnier,* with corrections from *Baluze* and *Gallandi,* in *Migne,* PL.,

[1] Ib. [2] Ib., c. 1. [3] *Migne,* PL., xlv. 1611—1664.
[4] Ib., xlviii. 63—108. [5] Ib., xlviii. 109—172.
[6] Ib., xlviii. 773—774. [7] Ib., xlviii. 909—932.
[8] Ib., xlviii. 213—214 1042—1043. [9] Ib., xlviii. 754—755.

xlviii, Paris, 1846. The need of a new critical edition has long been felt. For the writings of St. Cyril and Nestorius, translated by Mercator, see § 77, 9. — The Gallic monk Leporius had defended in his native place (Trier?) the teachings of Pelagius and Nestorius, but St. Augustine convinced him of his errors, whereupon he wrote about 418 in Africa a Libellus emendationis sive satisfactionis ad episcopos Galliae (Ib., xxxi. 1221 to 1230). For other details concerning Leporius see *Schoenemann,* Bibl. hist.-lit. Patr. lat., ii. 588—597. We have from the pen of Aurelius, bishop of Carthage († about 429), a circular letter De damnatione Pelagii atque Caelestii haereticorum, written in 419 (Ib., xx. 1009—1014). Cf. *Schoenemann,* l. c., ii. 1—7. — There are extant two letters of the successor of Aurelius, Capreolus: Ad Concilium Ephesinum, written in 431 (Greek and Latin), and De una Christi veri Dei et hominis persona contra recens damnatam haeresim Nestorii (Ib., liii. 843—858). Tillemont says that Capreolus is the author of some sermons in the works of St. Augustine concerning the devastations of the Vandals; see the article Capreolus in *Smith* and *Wace,* Dictionary of Christian Biography, i. 400—4001.

2. OROSIUS. — The Spanish priest Paulus Orosius was probably born at Bracara in Gallaecia (Braga in Portugal). For reasons unknown to us he left his fatherland and in 413 or 414 betook himself to Augustine at Hippo. In 414 he dedicated to the latter his: Commonitorium de errore Priscillianistarum et Origenistarum[1] (§ 89, 3), to which Augustine replied in his work: Ad Orosium contra Priscillianistas et Origenistas (§ 94, 5). Orosius was the companion of St. Jerome during the Pelagian controversy at Jerusalem, a fact that led to his difficulties with John, bishop of that city, who was on the side of Pelagius. Towards the end of 415 he wrote a: Liber apologeticus contra Pelagium de arbitrii libertate[2], and shortly afterwards left the Holy Land for Spain. In Minorca, however, he heard of the troubled condition of his fatherland, and again took refuge with Augustine, in whose company he completed (417—418) his principal work: Historiarum adversum paganos libri septem[3]. Thenceforth all traces of Orosius disappear; both the time and the place of his death are unknown. The Historiae were undertaken, according to the preface, at the request of Augustine, and were meant to be an appendix to the De civitate Dei (§ 94, 4). In them the reader should find the historical proofs that before the coming of Christ, mankind was more subject to wars, misfortunes, and evils of every kind than since His appearance on earth; it was, therefore, not the introduction of Christianity and the overthrow of paganism that were responsible for the sufferings of the barbarian invasions. It is from this standpoint that Orosius selects his historical material and weaves it into a chronicle-like sketch from Adam to the year 417. His chief sources are the Sacred Scripture, several Roman historians, and the Hieronymian recension of the Chronicle of Eusebius. From the year

[1] *Migne,* PL., xxxi. 1211—1216; xlii. 665—670. [2] Ib., xxxi. 1173—1212.
[3] Ib., xxxi. 663—1174.

378 the work possesses a special value; for these decades Orosius is a contemporary witness. This work was highly appreciated by all mediæval writers; the manuscripts that have reached us are in number about two hundred; king Alfred of England († 901) translated it into Anglo-Saxon.

The Historiae and the Liber apologeticus (*Migne*, PL., xxxi) are reprinted from the edition of *S. Haverkamp*, Leyden, 1738 (1767), the Commonitorium (lacking in Haverkamp) from *Gallandi*, Bibl. vet. Patr., ix. 174 to 175. We owe the latest edition of the Historiae and the Liber apologeticus to *C. Zangemeister* (Corpus script. eccl. lat. v), Vienna, 1882. A smaller edition of the Historiae was published by Zangemeister in the Bibliotheca Teubneriana, Leipzig, 1889. We have mentioned (§ 89, 3) the edition of the Commonitorium brought out by *G. Schepss*, Vienna, 1889. King Alfred's Anglo-Saxon version was published by *H. Sweet*, London, 1883. Cf. *H. Schilling*, König Alfreds angelsächsische Bearbeitung der Weltgeschichte des Orosius (Inaug.-Diss.), Halle, 1886. For an unedited letter of Orosius to Augustine see *A. Goldbacher*, in Zeitschr. f. die österreichischen Gymnasien (1883), xxxiv. 104, note 1; *S. Bäumer*, in Litt. Handweiser (1890), p. 59. *Th. de Mörner*, De Orosii vita eiusque historiarum libris VII adversus paganos, Berlin, 1844. *E. Méjean*, Paul Orose et son apologétique contre les païens (Thèse), Strassburg, 1862. *C. Paucker*, Vorarbeiten zur lateinischen Sprachgeschichte, herausgegeben von *H. Rönsch*, Berlin, 1884, part 3, pp. 24—53: De latinitate Orosii; cf. pp. 101—102. *G. Monod*, Sur un passage de Paul Orose (Historiae vii. 40), in Mélanges Paul Fabre, Paris, 1902, pp. 17—22. *G. Mercati*, Varianti d'un codice milanese al «Commonitorium de errore Priscillianistarum et Origenistarum» di Paolo Orosio, in Note di letteratura biblica e cristiana antica (Studi e Testi v), Rome, 1901, p. 136. — While Orosius was at Jerusalem, the body of the holy deacon Stephen was discovered in December 415 by the priest Lucian of Kaphar Gamala near Jerusalem. The latter made known the fact in a circular letter written in Greek and addressed to all Christians. It happened that a Spanish priest, Avitus of Bracara, was then resident at Jerusalem; he translated into Latin the letter of Lucian (*Gennad.*, De viris ill., cc. 46—47). The Greek original remains still unpublished, but there are two recensions of the Latin version; to both of them is prefixed a letter of Avitus to Balconius, bishop of Bracara (*Migne*, PL., xli. 805—818). A portion of the relics was brought by Orosius to Minorca; the conversion of a great many Jews was owing to the vigorous awakening of religious life that ensued; the history of these conversions is related by Severus, bishop of Minorca, in a circular letter dated 418: De virtutibus ad Iudaeorum conversionem in Minoricensi insula factis (Ib., xli. 821—832; cf. xx. 731—746). — About the same time the monk Bachiarius, probably also a Spaniard, wrote two works De fide (Ib., xx. 1019 to 1036) and De reparatione lapsi (Ib., xx. 1037—1062); cf. *Fessler-Jungmann*, Instit. Patrol., ii 1, 418—421. See also on the work De fide: *K. Künstle*, in his Antipriscilliana, Freiburg, 1905. The assertion of Sigebert of Gembloux: Isidorus Cordubensis episcopus scripsit ad Orosium libros quatuor in libros Regum (De viris ill., c. 51) is an error. There never was an Isidore of Cordova; cf. *Dom Morin*, in Revue des questions historiques (1885), xxxviii. 536—547.

3. ST. PROSPER AND HILARIUS. — In 428 or 429 two zealous laymen of Provence, Tiro Prosper of Aquitania and Hilarius, wrote

each a letter to St. Augustine informing him of the opposition to his doctrine on grace and predestination in Southern Gaul. Augustine replied in the *De praedestinatione sanctorum* and *De dono perseverantiae* (§ 94, 7). Apart from this letter[1] we have no other work of Hilarius. On the other hand, the letter of Prosper[2] is a kind of introduction to a long series of prose and metrical writings. The ascertained dates of the life of Prosper are all relative to his literary labors. He held it to be his special mission to suppress the above-mentioned opposition, or rather to attack and overthrow a doctrine that since mediæval times has been known as Semipelagianism, and which maintained that, for the beginning of our salvation and for perseverance in the state of grace, no divine aid was necessary In 429—430, Prosper laid down the state of the controversy in a long letter to an otherwise unknown friend Rufinus[3]; he published against the Semipelagians a poem of more than one thousand hexameters entitled περὶ ἀχαρίστων i. e. *De ingratis*[4]; he wrote also in elegiac metre two *Epigrammata in obtrectatorem Augustini,* in reply to the attacks of an anonymous Semipelagian[5]. It is possible that the *obtrectator* was John Cassian (§ 96, 1), the head of the Semipelagians. The term ἀχάριστοι or *ingrati* is applied to the Semipelagians as being enemies of divine grace. After the death of Augustine (Aug. 28., 430), Prosper and his friend Hilarius went to Rome in order to obtain from Pope Celestine the condemnation of Semipelagianism. The pope did not hesitate to write to the bishops of Gaul[6] warning them and imposing silence on the innovators, defending in grateful terms the memory of Augustine, and recognizing in a very flattering way the efforts of Prosper and his friend. Thenceforth Prosper appears as the anti-Pelagian champion specially authorized by the Apostolic see: Fidem contra Pelagianos ex Apostolicae sedis auctoritate defendimus[7]. In 431—432, apparently, he wrote: Epitaphium Nestorianae et Pelagianae haereseon[8], an ironical elegy for the Nestorianism and Pelagianism apropos of the Ephesine decrees of 431, Pro Augustino responsiones ad capitula obiectionum Gallorum calumniantium[9], a refutation of the objections directed against the Augustinian doctrine of predestination; Pro Augustino responsiones ad capitula obiectionum Vincentianarum[10], also in defence of the same doctrine, and probably against Vincent of Lérins (§ 96, 4); Pro Augustino responsiones ad excerpta Genuensium[11], an explanation of selected passages from Augustine's *De praedestinatione*

[1] 226 among the letters of Augustine; *Migne,* PL., xxxiii. 1007—1012.
[2] 225 among the letters of Augustine; Ib., 1002—1007; li. 67—74.
[3] Ep. ad Rufinum de gratia et libero arbitrio; Ib., li. 77—90.
[4] Ib., li. 91—148. [5] Ib, li. 149—152.
[6] Ib., l. 528—530; xlv. 1755—1756.
[7] Resp. ad obiect. Vincent. praef.; *Migne,* PL., li. 178. [8] Ib., li. 153—154.
[9] Ib., li. 155—174. [10] Ib., li. 177—186. [11] Ib., li. 187—202.

*sanctorum* and *De dono perseverantiae,* written at the request of two priests of Genoa; De gratia Dei et libero arbitrio liber contra Collatorem[1], against Cassian, the author of the *Collationes,* in the thirteenth of which it is taught that sometimes divine grace forestalls our will and sometimes our will forestalls divine grace (§ 96, 1). It is probable that these works were immediately followed by a Chronicle in continuation of the Chronicle of St. Jerome. It was frequently revised and continued by the author himself, and has reached us in at least three editions, the first of which stops at 433, the second at 445, and the third at 455. In the last form it is known as *Chronicon integrum*[2]; the edition of 445, the first to be printed, is known as the *Chronicon vulgatum.* This work differs from all previous chronicles in the prominence it gives to the history of doctrine and heresies. Prosper wrote about 433 the *Expositio Psalmorum a 100 usque ad 150*[3] for which he drew on the *Enarrationes in Psalmos* (§ 94, 8) of St. Augustine, it is very probably only a remnant of an entire commentary on the Psalms. Concerning the activity of Prosper in the years immediately following we have no information. In 440 he seems to have accompanied the newly-elected pope Leo I. from Gaul to Rome, and to have entered the service of the papal chancery. Gennadius says[4] that he was held to be the author of letters bearing the name of Leo I. He published at Rome: Sententiarum ex operibus S. Augustini delibatarum liber[5], a kind of summa of the Augustinian theology in 392 sentences drawn from every class of the works of Augustine, also: Epigrammatum ex sententiis S. Augustini[6], one hundred and six distichs that exhibit as many «sentences» from the above-mentioned collection. Many other works were erroneously attributed to him, among them the *De vocatione omnium gentium* (see no. 5). It seems that he died in 463; the Church has placed him among her Saints, and he was looked on by his contemporaries as the chief disciple of Augustine. Devout admiration for the ideas of his master and a thorough study of them were his principal characteristics. He was capable not only of penetrating their depth, but of expressing them with elegance and accuracy Though he sought to tone down somewhat the harshness and gloominess of the opinions of Augustine, he clung with firmness to the antecedent (i. e. independent of divine foreknowledge of merit) predestination to eternal life of a definite number of men; on the other hand, he considered non-predestination or reprobation to be exclusively the result of divine fore-knowledge of the evil deeds of men.

The best edition of the works of Prosper was issued by the Benedictines *J. B. Le Brun des Marettes* and *D. Mangeant,* Paris, 1711,

[1] Ib., li. 213—276. [2] Ib., li. 535—606. [3] Ib., li. 277—426.
[4] De viris ill., c. 84. [5] *Migne,* PL., li. 427—496. [6] Ib., li. 497—532.

Venice, 1744, 2 vols.; ib., 1782, 2 vols. (*Migne,* PL., li; most of the writings of Prosper are also ib., xlv. 1793—1898). For earlier editions see *Schoenemann,* Bibl. hist.-lit. Patr. lat., ii. 1022 ff. in *Migne,* PL., li. 49 ff. In *Hurter,* SS. Patr. opusc. sel. (vol. xxiv), is reprinted: S. Prosperi Aquitani carmen de ingratis, also (vols. xxxv xxxvi): S. Augustini et S. Prosperi de gratia opuscula selecta. — *A. Franz,* Prosper von Aquitanien, in Österr. Vierteljahresschr. f. kath. Theol. (1869), viii. 355—392 481—524. *L. Valentin,* St. Prosper d'Aquitaine, Paris, 1900 (xii. 934 pp.); cf. *L. Couture,* in Bulletin de littérature ecclésiast. (1900), pp. 269—282. The doctrine of Prosper is discussed by *Fr. Wörter,* Beiträge zur Gesch. des Semipelagianismus, Paderborn, 1898. *J. Turmel,* La controverse sémipélagienne: I. Saint Augustin et la controverse sémipélagienne, in Revue d'hist. et de littér. religieuses (1904), pp. 418—433. A new edition of his Chronicle was brought out by *Th. Mommsen,* in Mon. Germ. hist. Auct. antiquiss., Berlin, 1892, ix 1, 341—485. For later revisions of this Chronicle, Chronicon imperiale (*Migne,* PL., li. 859—866), Prosper Augustanus etc., cf. *Teuffel-Schwabe,* Gesch. der röm. Lit., pp. 1176—1177, and *Wattenbach,* Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen im Mittelalter, 6. ed., i. 80—83. The Chronicle of Prosper was the basis of the Paschal Table repared in 437 by the Aquitanian Victorius or Victurius, and edited anew by *Mommsen,* l. c., pp. 666—735: Cursus paschalis annorum 532 ad Hilarum archidiaconum ecclesiae Romanae. For Victorius cf. *Teuffel Schwabe,* l. c., p. 1208. That Prosper wrote the graceful Poema coniugis ad uxorem (*Migne,* PL., li. 611—616) is very doubtful; cf. *Manitius,* Gesch. der christl.-latein. Poesie, pp. 211—212. The long Carmen de providentia divina (Ib., PL., li. 617—638) was composed in Southern Gaul about 415 by some Pelagian or Semipelagian; cf. *Ebert,* Allg. Gesch. der Literatur des Mittelalters im Abendlande, 2. ed., i. 316—320, and *Manitius,* l. c., pp. 170 to 180. The Hymnus abecedarius against the anti-Trinitarians edited by *A. Boucherie,* Mélanges latins et bas-latins, Montpellier, 1875, pp. 12—26, is not a work of Prosper. Similarly the Confessio S. Prosperi (*Migne,* PL., li. 607—610) is spurious. The large work De promissionibus et praedictionibus Dei (Ib., li. 753—838) was written about 440 by an African, perhaps known as Prosper. The so-called Praeteritorum sedis Apostolicae episcoporum auctoritates de gratia Dei have usually been added, since the end of the fifth century, as an appendix to the above-mentioned letters of Celestine to the bishops of Gaul (Ib., li. 205—212; l. 531—537), but it cannot be proved that they are the work of Prosper. The popes indicated in the title as praeteriti sedis Apostolicae episcopi are Innocent I. (401 to 417) and Zosimus (417—418), predecessors of Celestine I. (422—432). The popes of this time are represented by a number of letters: there are thirty-eight of Innocent I. (*Migne,* PL., xx. 463 ff.), fifteen of Zosimus (Ib., xx. 639 ff.), nine of Boniface I. (418—422; ib., xx. 749 ff.), and sixteen of Celestine I. (Ib., l. 417 ff.). For more minute details of these letters cf. *Jaffé,* Regesta Pontificum Rom., 2. ed., Leipzig, 1885, i. 44—57. Many early papal letters were translated into German by *S. Wenzlowsky,* Die Briefe der Päpste (Bibl. der Kirchenväter), iii. 7 ff.; cf. *H. Gebhardt,* Die Bedeutung Innocenz I. für die Entwicklung der päpstlichen Gewalt (Dissert.), Leipzig, 1901. *J. Wittig,* Studien zur Geschichte des Papstes Innocenz I. und der Papstwahlen des 5. Jahrhunderts, in Theol. Quartalschrift (1902), lxxxiv. 388—439.

4. PAULINUS OF MILAN. — This Milanese ecclesiastic had been secretary to St. Ambrose, and after his death repaired to St. Augustine in Africa. While there he wrote at the suggestion of the latter

a Vita S. Ambrosii[1], in imitation of the famous Vita S. Martini (§ 92, 1). His purpose, like that of Sulpicius Severus, was one of piety and edification. Paulinus also wrote *Libellus adversus Caelestium* (§ 94, 7) Zosimo papae oblatus[2], and: De benedictionibus patriarcharum libellus[3].

The Vita S. Ambrosii is found in most editions of that Saint's works, e. g. in the recent edition of *P. A. Ballerini* (§ 90, 9), vi. 885—906. For the editions of both Libelli cf. *Schoenemann*, Bibl. hist.-lit. Patr. lat. ii. 599—602. *A. Papadopulos-Kerameus* published in the Ἀνάλεκτα ἱεροσολυμιτικῆς σταχυολογίας, St. Petersburg, 1891, i. 27—88, an old Greek translation of this life of St. Ambrose. *E. Bouvy*, Paulin de Milan, in Revue Augustinienne (1902), pp. 497—514.

5. ANONYMOUS. — Special mention is due to a work in two books written about the middle of the fifth century: De vocatione omnium gentium[4]. Unsuccessful attempts have been made to show that it was written either by St. Prosper or by Leo I. In the work which was highly esteemed, even by his contemporaries, the author asks himself whether and in what sense all mankind are called to be saved, and why only some men are saved. He says in the first lines of his work (i. 1, 1) that his purpose is to effect a reconciliation between the Semipelagians and the orthodox: inter defensores liberi arbitrii et praedicatores gratiae Dei.

This anonymous writer is usually credited with the authorship of the equally anonymous Epistola ad sacram virginem Demetriadem seu De humilitate tractatus (*Migne*, PL., lv. 161—180), reprinted in *Hurter's* Opuscula selecta iii. Concerning the question of authorship cf. *Ed. Perthel*, Papst Leos I. Leben und Lehren, Jena, 1843, pp. 127—134. The teaching of De vocatione is discussed by *Fr. Wörter*, Zur Dogmengeschichte des Semipelagianismus, Münster, 1900, in Kirchengeschichtl. Studien, v. 2.

### § 96. Gallic writers.

1. CASSIAN. — John Cassian, abbot at Massilia (Marseilles), is usually considered the father of Semipelagianism (§ 95, 3). He was born probably about 360, not in Southern Gaul, but in «Scythia»[5] i. e. in the Dobrudscha, of educated and wealthy parents. He received his religious training in one of the monasteries of Bethlehem together with his somewhat older friend Germanus. Both were desirous of a closer acquaintance with Egypt, the fatherland of monasticism, and about 385 journeyed thither; they lived seven years among the hermits of that land, and then, with the permission of their superiors at Bethlehem, three years more. On their departure from Egypt (expelled by Theophilus, patriarch of Alexandria?) they went to Constan-

[1] *Migne*, PL., xiv. 27—46. [2] Ib., xx. 711—716; xlv. 1724—1725.
[3] Gen. xlix; *Migne*, PL., xx. 715—732.
[4] *Migne*, PL., xvii. 1073—1132; li. 647—722.
[5] *Gennad.*, De viris ill., c. 61.

tinople, where Cassian was ordained deacon by St. John Chrysostom. In 405 we meet the two friends at Rome charged by the clergy of Constantinople to recommend to the protection of Innocent I. the person of St. John Chrysostom who had been exiled in 404 for the second time. Here Cassian seems to have been ordained to the priesthood. About 415 he opened two monasteries near Marseilles, one for men, the other for women. Partly by reason of this establishment (though it was not the first in the West, see no. 2), and partly by the works that he now began to compile, he contributed very much to the diffusion of the monastic system, especially throughout Gaul and Spain. He died, the object of universal veneration, about 435. In many places, especially at Marseilles, he is honored as a Saint. — At the suggestion of Castor, bishop of Apta Julia in Narbonese Gaul, Cassian composed (419—428) two large works that mutually complete one another, and were meant for the instruction, edification and consolation of the monks. The first was finished in 426 and is entitled: De institutis coenobiorum et de octo principalium vitiorum remediis libri xii[1]. In the first four books he treats of the organization and the rules of the monasteries in Palestine and Egypt; in the remaining eight he describes and denounces the eight dominant vices of monastic life: gluttony, incontinency, love of money, anger, melancholy, weariness (acedia), vain glory (cenodoxia), and arrogance. The second work: Collationes xxiv[2] describes the conversations of Cassian and his friend Germanus with the Egyptian hermits. It was written and published in three sections: Coll. i—x; xi—xvii, xviii—xxiv. The third section was the first written and contains their latest conversations with the monks and the very lively impressions made on our authors. Collations i—x are posterior, by reason of their contents, to Collations xi—xxiv. The third and last part was completed before 429. Cassian himself explains that the former work (Instituta) deals with the external life of the monk, while the latter (Collationes) aims at his internal or spiritual perfection: Hi libelli ad exterioris hominis observantiam et institutionem coenobiorum competentius aptabuntur, illi vero ad disciplinam interioris ac perfectionem cordis et anachoretarum vitam atque doctrinam potius pertinebunt[3]. The general excellence of their contents, their popular style and easy diction won universal approval for both works; they were highly prized as a manual of monasticism. Eucherius (see no. 2), a friend of Cassian, seems to have made a compendium of their contents[4] They must also have been soon translated into Greek[5] A Greek excerpt of the Instituta is published in Migne[6] There are, however, in both works some chapters

[1] *Migne,* PL., xlix. 53—476. [2] Ib., xlix. 477—1328.
[3] Instit., ii. 9. [4] *Gennad.,* De viris ill., c. 63. [5] *Phot.,* Bibl. Cod. 197.
[6] PG., xxviii. 849—906, and in Latin, PL., l. 867—894.

that are Semipelagian in character and tendency, and must, therefore, have scandalized the friends and followers of Augustine (§ 95, 3); this is particularly the case with Collation xiii: De protectione Dei. In it are found the following phrases: (Deus) cum in nobis ortum quendam bonae voluntatis inspexerit, illuminat eam confestim atque confortat et incitat ad salutem, incrementum tribuens ei quam vel ipse plantavit vel nostro conatu viderit emersisse (c. 8); ut autem evidentius clareat etiam per naturae bonum, quod beneficio creatoris indultum est, nonnunquam bonarum voluntatum prodire principia, quae tamen, nisi a Domino dirigantur, ad consummationem virtutum pervenire non possunt, apostolus testis est dicens[1]: velle enim adiacet mihi, perficere autem bonum non invenio (c. 9); sin vero a gratia Dei semper inspirari bonae voluntatis principia dixerimus, quid de Zachæi fide, quid de illius in cruce latronis pietate dicemus, qui desiderio suo vim quandam regnis caelestibus inferentes specialia vocationis monita praevenerunt? (c. 11.) The teaching of the Church with which he is here in evident opposition, was on another occasion vigorously defended by him. At the request of Pope Leo the Great, then a Roman deacon, he took up his pen for the third time and wrote (430—431) a work in seven books *De incarnatione Domini contra Nestorium*[2].

The works of Cassian were first edited by *Al. Gazaeus (Gazet)*, Douai, 1616, and have often been reprinted from that edition (*Migne*, PL., xlix l). The latest and best edition is that of *M. Petschenig*, Vienna, 1886—1888, 2 vols. (Corpus script. eccles. lat. xiii xvii). The Epistola S. Castoris ad Cassianum (*Migne*, PL., xlix. 53—54) made known by *Gazaeus*, is described as spurious by *Petschenig*, i (1888), Proleg. cxi f. *K. Wotke* began (Vienna, 1898) a new edition of the above-mentioned excerpt from Cassian's Instituta. Cf. *Fr Diekamp*, in Röm. Quartalschr. für christliche Altertumskunde und für Kirchengesch. (1900), xiv. 341—355. A German translation of all three works of Cassian was prepared by *A. Abt* and *K. Kohlhund*, Kempten, 1879, 2 vols. (Blbliothek der Kirchenväter); cf. *C. v. Paucker*, Die Latinität des Johannes Cassianus, in Romanische Forschungen, Erlangen, 1886, ii. 391—448. For the arguments concerning the (disputed) birth-place of Cassian see *A. Hoch*, in Theol. Quartalschr. (1900), lxxxii. 43—69 (Syria), and *S. Merkle*, ib., pp. 419—441 (Dobrudscha). *A. Hoch*, Lehre des Johannes Cassianus von Natur und Gnade, Freiburg i. Br., 1895; cf. *Fr. Wörter*, Beiträge zur Dogmengeschichte des Semipelagianismus, Paderborn, 1898. *O. Abel*, Studien zu dem gallischen Presbyter Johannes Cassianus (Diss.), Erlangen, 1904. — Early in the fifth century a Gallic priest and monk, Evagrius (*Gennad.*, De viris ill., c. 50; *Sulpic. Sev.*, Dial. iii. 1, 4; 2, 8) published an Altercatio Simonis Judaei et Theophili Christiani, in which the objections of the Jew are solved by the Christian interlocutor (*Migne*, PL., xx. 1165—1182); it was more correctly edited (1883) by *A. Harnack*, in Texte und Untersuchungen, i 3, 1—136. The work is evidently dependent on the dialogue of *Aristo*, «Jason and Papiscus» (§ 16); it is not, however, as Harnack (l. c.) maintained, a mere translation or revision of that work. Cf. *P. Corssen*, Die

[1] Rom. vii. 18. [2] *Migne*, PL., l. 9—272.

Altercatio Sim. Iud. et Theop. Christ. auf ihre Quellen geprüft, Berlin, 1890; *Th. Zahn,* Forschungen zur Gesch. des neutestamentl. Kanons etc. (1891), iv. 308—329; *P. Batiffol,* in Revue Biblique (1899), viii. 337—345; *G. Morin,* in Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique (1900), i. 267—273, and in Revue Bénédictine (1902), xix. 243—245. *Evagrii* Altercatio legis inter Simonem Iudaeum et Theophilum Christianum. Recensuit Eduardus Bratke (Corpus scriptorum eccles. latinorum, vol. xxxxv), Vienna, 1904.

2. ST. HONORATUS OF ARLES AND ST. EUCHERIUS OF LYONS. — The second part of the Collationes of Cassian (xi—xvii) is dedicated to the monks (fratres) Honoratus and Eucherius. Honoratus, a man of noble birth, had, early in the fifth century, created a flourishing centre of monastic life in the isle of Lerinum or Lirinum (now St. Honoré), the second largest of the group of islets off the south-eastern coast of Gaul, that had previously been an abandoned solitude inhabited only by serpents. About 426 he was called to the ancient and famous metropolitan see of Arles, where (in 428 or early in 429) his beneficent labors were cut short by death. His writings, the rule of his monastery, and his apparently very extensive correspondence are known to us only by quotations and references. — About 410 Eucherius, also of noble descent and father of a family, joined the pious brotherhood at Lerinum; he afterwards retired to the neighboring and larger island of Lero (now Ste. Marguérite). About 424 he was elected bishop of Lyons, but we know nothing of his episcopal life. He died, according to Gennadius[1], between 450 and 455. Apart from the above-mentioned (see no. 1) excerpt of the writings of Cassian, Eucherius left two letters laudatory of the monastic state: De laude eremi ad Hilarium Lirinensem presbyterum epistola[2], and: Epistola paraenetica ad Valerianum cognatum de contemptu mundi et saecularis philosophiae[3], also two larger works introductory to the science of Sacred Scripture: Formularum spiritalis intelligentiae ad Veranum liber unus[4], and: Instructionum ad Salonium libri duo[5]; Veranus and Salonius were the sons of the author. These *Formulae spiritalis intelligentiae,* explanatory of the figurative terms and phrases of the Bible, became very popular works. Eucherius is also very probably the author of the much-disputed account of the martyrdom of the Theban Legion: Passio Agaunensium martyrum, SS. Mauricii ac sociorum eius[6], a martyrdom which the latest researches have shown to be beyond doubt a real event in the early period of the persecution of Diocletian. In the small collection of homilies[7] the genuine and the spurious are found together. The authenticity of a letter: Ad Faustum s. Faustinum de situ Iudaeae urbisque Hierosolymitanae (lacking in Migne) is uncertain. A letter

[1] *Gennad.,* De viris ill., c. 63. [2] *Migne,* PL., l. 701—712.
[3] Ib., l. 711—726. [4] Ib., l. 727—772, an enlarged text.
[5] Ib., l. 773—822. [6] Ib., l. 827—832.
[7] Ib., l. 833—868 1207—1212.

*Ad Philonem*[1] and extensive commentaries on Genesis[2] and on the Books of Kings[3] are considered to be spurious.

Our principal authority for the life of St. Honoratus is a funeral discourse by Hilarius of Arles (see no. 3); cf. *Bardenhewer,* in Wetzer und Weltes Kirchenlexikon, 2. ed., s. v. Honoratus von Arles. — For the editions of the works of St. Eucherius see *Schoenemann,* Bibl. hist.-lit. Patr. lat., ii. 775—795 (*Migne,* PL., l. 687—698). A new edition was undertaken by *K. Wotke,* part I, Vienna, 1894 (Corpus script. eccles. lat. xxxi). The Formulae spiritalis intelligentiae are interpolated and falsified in most of the manuscripts. The original text is given by *Wotke,* l. c., pp. 1—62. For a later excerpt of this text cf. *Wotke,* Praef., xvi. The Passio Agaunensium martyrum was also edited by *Br. Krusch*, in Monum. Germ. hist. script. rer. Meroving. (1896), iii. 20—41; on the literature about this martyrdom see *A. Hirschmann,* in Hist. Jahrbuch (1892), xiii. 783—798. Cf. *R. Berg,* Der hl. Mauricius und die thebäische Legion, Halle, 1895. The letter Ad Faustinum de situ Iudeae is re-edited by *P. Geyer,* Itinera Hierosolymitana, Vienna, 1898, pp. 123—134. *K. Wotke* also edited the beginning of the commentary on Gen. i to iv. 1, Vienna, 1897. On Eucherius in general cf. *A. Mellier,* De vita et scriptis S. Eucherii Lugdun. episc. (Thèse), Lyons, 1878. *A. Gouilloud,* St. Eucher, Lérins et l'église de Lyon au V^e^ siècle, Lyons, 1881. — The two sons of our Saint, Salonius and Veranus, were also bishops, of Geneva and Vence respectively. Salonius wrote Expositiones mysticae in Parabolas Salomonis (*Migne,* PL., liii. 967—994), and in Ecclesiasten (Ib., liii. 993—1012), in the form of a dialogue hetween Salonius and Veranus. Among the letters of Leo I. (as no. 68; Ib., liii. 887—890) is one addressed to this pope by the bishops Ceretius (of Grenoble), Salonius and Veranus. *M. Besson,* Un évêque exégète de Genève au milieu du V^e^ siècle. Saint Salone, in «Anzeiger für Schweizerische Geschichte» (1904), pp. 252—265. — There is exstant a letter of the priest Rusticus to Eucherius, written to thank the latter for the permission to copy two of his works, probably Instructionum ad Salonium libri duo (Ib., lviii. 489—490; *Wotke,* S. Euch. Lugd. op., i. 198—199). The author of this letter is identified by some with that Rusticus of Bordeaux who appears in the letters of Apollinaris Sidonius (ii. 11; viii. 11), and by others (among them *Wotke*) with Rusticus, bishop of Narbonne (427—461).

3. HILARIUS OF ARLES. — Hilarius was induced by Abbot Honoratus (see no. 2) to embrace the monastic life at Lerins, and was scarcely thirty years of age when he succeeded (428 or early in 429) his master in the metropolitan see of Arles. In the letter of Prosper to Augustine (§ 95, 3) concerning the opponents of the doctrine of Augustine on grace and predestination, Hilarius is mentioned, but in a manner very flattering to him: Unum eorum praecipuae auctoritatis et spiritualium studiorum virum, sanctum Hilarium Arelatensem episcopum, sciat beatitudo tua admiratorem sectatoremque in aliis omnibus tuae esse doctrinae[4]. Among the events of his later life we may mention the discreditable conflict of Hilarius with Pope Leo I., in his quality of vicar of the Apostolic See in Southern Gaul. In consequence he lost for his own person the privileges accorded to

[1] Ib., l. 1213—1214. [2] Ib., l. 893—1048.
[3] Ib., l. 1047—1208. [4] *S. Aug.,* Ep. 225, 9.

the metropolitan see of Arles, and even his archiepiscopal office. He died according to Gennadius[1] between 450 and 455. Among his works Gennadius[2] praises the *Vita S. Honorati praedecessoris sui*[3], a discourse delivered, probably in 430, on the anniversary of the death of St. Honoratus. The other writings of Hilarius are not individually described by Gennadius; they are according to the Vita S. Hilarii Arelat.[4]: homiliae in totius anni festivitatibus expeditae, symboli expositio ambienda, epistolarum vero tantus numerus, versus etiam fontis ardentis. The editions of his writings contain, beside the Vita S. Honorati, only a brief letter to Eucherins of Lyons[5], and three *opuscula dubia:* Sermo seu narratio de miraculo S. Genesii martyris Arelat.[6], and two poems already mentioned (§ 87, 8): Versus in natali Machabaeorum martyrum[7] and: Metrum in Genesim ad Leonem papam[8].

The edition of the writings of Hilarius in Migne (PL., l) is incomplete. We have already mentioned (§ 61, 2) his homilies; of the Versus fontis ardentis (St. Barthélemy near Grenoble) four are extant, cf. *Manitius,* Geschichte der christl.-latein. Poesie, Stuttgart, 1891, pp. 188 f. The letter to Eucherius was re-edited by *Wotke,* S. Euch. Lugd. op., i. 197—198. The dubious hymns on the Maccabees and the beginning of Genesis were lately (1891) edited by *Peiper* (§ 87, 8). The exposition of the seven Catholic epistles, published in Spicilegium Casinense (1897), iii 1, and attributed to our Hilarius, is of very doubtful provenance. — The abovementioned Vita S. Hilarii Arelat. (*Migne,* PL., l. 1219—1246) is usually attributed to Honoratus, bishop of Marseilles, contemporary of Pope Gelasius (492—496). This Honoratus did write (*Gennad.,* De viris ill., c. 99) many homilies and also lives of «holy Fathers»: Sanctorum quoque patrum vitas, praecipue nutritoris sui Hilarii Arelatensis episcopi. Cf. *Bardenhewer,* in Kirchenlexikon of Wetzer and Welte, 2. ed., s. v. Honoratus von Marseille. — St. Lupus, a brother in law of St. Hilarius and (427 to 479) bishop of Troyes, seems to have carried on an extensive correspondence of which there remains but one letter addressed to Talasius, bishop of Angers (*Migne,* PL., lviii. 66—68), by Lupus in common with Euphronius, bishop of Autun. The letter of Lupus congratulating his friend Apollinaris Sidonius (Ib., lvii. 63—65) on his election as bishop of Clermont (about 470), is a forgery of Vignier; cf. § 3, 2.

4. VINCENT OF LERINUM. — A little work of Vincentius, a priest and monk of Lerinum, met with extraordinary success. In 434 he composed under the pseudonym of Peregrinus two *Commonitoria* (memoranda) destined, he tells us, to aid his weak memory, and to remind him for ever of the teachings of the holy Fathers. The first book treats of the marks by which the true Catholic faith may be distinguished from heretical novelties. The second book applies these criteria to a concrete example, the condemnation of Nestorianism

[1] De viris ill., c. 69. [2] Ib. [3] *Migne,* PL., l. 1249—1272.
[4] c. 11, n. 14; *Migne,* PL., l. 1232. [5] Ib., l. 1271—1272.
[6] Ib., l. 1273—1276. [7] Ib., l. 1275—1286.
[8] Ib., l. 1287—1292.

that had taken place at Ephesus «about three years ago» (c. 42). This second work has perished; there remains, however, the index of the contents of both works united (as cc. 41—43) at a very early date, with the first book and making one work with it. The little treatise is written in simple, clear, and relatively correct style and develops properly the fundamental principles of positive dogmatic demonstration. The words: Magnopere curandum est ut id teneamus quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus creditum est; hoc est etenim vere proprieque catholicum (c. 3), have become a household word of Catholic theology Similarly the phrase: Crescat igitur oportet et multum vehementerque proficiat tam singulorum quam omnium, tam unius hominis quam totius ecclesiae aetatum ac saeculorum gradibus intelligentia, scientia, sapientia, sed in suo dumtaxat genere, in eodem scilicet dogmate, eodem sensu eademque sententia (c. 28). The correctness of these principles is not affected by the inexact application of them made by Vincentius himself; in some passages of his work he is out-spokenly Semipelagian. He refers, no doubt, to Augustine and his followers when he speaks of certain heretics (haeretici) who dare to teach, quod in ecclesia sua magna et specialis et plane personalis quaedam sit Dei gratia, adeo ut sine ullo labore etiamsi nec petant nec quaerant nec pulsent, quicumque illi ad numerum suum pertinent, tamen ita divinitus dispensentur ut numquam possint offendere (c. 37). Augustine had written[1]: falluntur qui putant esse a nobis, non dari nobis, ut petamus, quaeramus, pulsemus. It is very probable that this little work, in spite of its apparently harmless introductory words, was written as a controversial reply to the doctrine of Augustine; the author's use of a pseudonym is already suggestive of a certain polemical tendency, while the work of Prosper against Vincentius (§ 95, 3) leads us to suspect that the author of the *Commonitoria* was still further involved in the conflict with Augustinism.

The Commonitorium of Vincentius has gone through innumerable editions. The best is that of *Etienne Baluze*, in an appendix to his edition of Salvianus of Marseilles, Paris, 1663 1669 1684 (*Migne*, PL., l. 637—686, and in *Hurter's* Opuscula selecta, ix). A separate edition with many notes was isued by *E. Klüpfel*, Vienna, 1809. A new edition for academic use is that of *A. Jülicher*, Sammlung ausgewählter kirchen- und dogmengeschichtlicher Quellenschriften, x, Freiburg i. Br., 1895. It was translated into German by *U. Uhl*, Kempten, 1870 (Bibl. der Kirchenväter). Cf. *Hefele*, Beiträge zur Kirchengesch., Archäol. u. Liturgik, Tübingen, 1864, i. 145 to 174. *W S. Reilly*, «Quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus». Etude sur la règle de foi de St. Vincent de Lérins (Thèse), Tours, 1903. — There is no foundation for the hypothesis of *Poirel* that Vincentius of Lerinum is identical with Marius Mercator (§ 95, 1), and that the second Commonitorium may be reconstructed from the latter's writings: *R. M. J. Poirel*, De utroque Commonitorio Lirinensi (Thèse), Nancy, 1895; Vin-

[1] De dono persev. 23, 64.

centii Peregrini seu alio nomine Marii Mercatoris Lirinensia Commonitoria duo, Nancy, 1898. See a reply to Poirel by *H. Koch,* in Theol. Quartalschrift (1899), lxxxi. 396—434.

5. VALERIANUS OF CEMELE. — Twenty homilies of Valerianus, bishop (about 450) of Cemele, a city near Nice that has long since disappeared, mostly ascetical in contents, have been preserved[1], likewise his: Epistola ad monachos de virtutibus et ordine doctrinae apostolicae[2]

The first of these homilies, De bono disciplinae, was originally printed among the works of Augustine (*Migne,* PL., xl. 1219—1222). Both the homilies and the letter were first edited by *J. Sirmond,* Paris, 1612. For later editions and the controversy concerning the orthodoxy of Valerianus cf. *Schoenemann,* Bibl. hist.-lit. Patr. lat., ii. 814—822 (*Migne,* PL., lii. 686 to 690). *N. Schack,* De Valeriano saeculi v. homileta christiano, Kopenhagen, 1814. — The bishop Maximus, whose letter to Theophilus of Alexandria (385—412) was first edited (1871) by *A. Reifferscheid* and then (1877) by *L. Delisle,* was probably an inhabitant of South-eastern Gaul. *G. Morin,* La lettre de l'évêque Maxime à Théophile d'Alexandrie, in Revue Bénéd. (1894), xi. 274—278.

### § 97. Pope St. Leo the Great and other Italian writers.

1. LIFE OF LEO THE GREAT. — Leo I. takes his place beside Gregory I. as the greatest of the popes of Christian antiquity. The time and place of his birth are not known with certainty. As early as the time of Celestine I. (422—432) he was a deacon of the Apostolic See, highly esteemed and influential. In the preface to his *De incarnatione Domini* (430 or 431) John Cassian calls him: Romanae ecclesiae ac divini ministerii decus. During his absence in Gaul on a delicate political mission, Sixtus III. (432—440) died, and Leo was elected pope. He was consecrated on his return to Rome (Sept. 29., 440). It was a troublous and a trying hour. On the one hand, the Roman empire was overrun by hordes of barbarians, and on the other, the powerful external bulwark of ecclesiastical unity was in danger of collapsing. In the East Eutychianism or Monophysitism, the doctrine of one composite nature in Christ, lifted its head threateningly, and together with this new heresy the Byzantine jealousy of Old Rome grew more bold perhaps than at any previous period. Leo seemed as though born for the needs of his time. He saw that the only hope of saving all the interests involved lay in the full realization and development of the papal primacy, the foundation of ecclesiastical unity. This idea fills his mind and thoroughly dominates him. He develops in its service a marvellous energy and a world-embracing activity. Though he never deviates from his purpose, he chooses his means with prudence, and in practical matters exhibits both equity and moderation; in matters of doctrine he is al-

[1] *Migne,* PL., lii. 691—756. [2] Ib., lii. 755—758.

ways firm and unchangeable; at the same time he is a dexterous theologian and a skilful diplomat. It is in his relations with the East that his greatness is most easily perceived. His letter to Flavian, patriarch of Constantinople[1], (June 13., 449), was the polar star of the Catholics during the Monophysite controversies. He was the first to denounce as a *latrocinium* the Ephesine Synod of 449[2], and the opprobrious epithet has been sanctioned by posterity. He willingly sanctioned the doctrinal decrees of the Council of Chalcedon (451), but he rejected with decision the twenty-eighth canon of that Council in which the see of Constantinople was guaranteed a superior dignity at the expense of the other patriarchal sees of the East. He saved old Rome also from external dangers: he induced Attila (452) to abandon his designs on Rome and retire, and he persuaded Genseric (455) to spare at least the lives of the Romans. It was only natural that by such great deeds the temporal authority and the political importance of the Holy See should be increased; and thus it is that the pontificate of Leo opens a new epoch in the history of the papacy. Leo died Nov. 10., 461, honored by all for his glorious services to the Church. He was soon venerated as a Saint, and Benedict XIV placed him (1754) among the *doctores ecclesiae.*

2. THE WRITINGS OF LEO. — They are partly homilies and partly letters. Of the former there are one hundred and sixteen in the classic edition of the Ballerini brothers; of these ninety-six are genuine[3] and twenty are either spurious or of doubtful authenticity[4]. The genuine homilies belong entirely to the period of his pontificate. Most of them are festal discourses, delivered on feast days of our Lord or of the Saints. The first five were preached on the occasion of the anniversary of his election to the See of Peter, many others during Lent or the Ember days. They are free from all prolixity, at times even strikingly brief. Their style is solemn and elevated, and Latin scholars admire the purity of their diction. Theologians read them with delight, for they are filled with splendid testimonies to the papal primacy, its divine establishment, its uninterrupted activity, and the fulness of authority for which it stands. On one of the anniversaries of his election, he spoke as follows: In persona humilitatis meae ille intelligatur, ille honoretur, in quo et omnium pastorum sollicitudo cum commendatarum sibi ovium custodia perseverat, et cuius dignitas etiam in indigno haerede non deficit[5]. On a similar occasion: De toto mundo unus Petrus eligitur, qui et universarum gentium vocationi et omnibus apostolis cunctisque ecclesiae patribus praeponatur, ut quamvis in populo Dei multi sacerdotes sint multique pastores, omnes tamen proprie regat Petrus, quos principaliter regit et Christus[6]. On the natal day (i. e. of martyrdom) of the

[1] Ep. 28. [2] Ep. 95, 2. [3] *Migne,* PL., liv. 137—468.
[4] Ib., liv. 477—522. [5] Sermo 3, 4. [6] Sermo 4, 2.

apostles Peter and Paul Leo thus apostrophizes the Eternal City: Isti sunt qui te ad hanc gloriam provexerunt, ut gens sancta, populus electus, civitas sacerdotalis et regia, per sacram beati Petri sedem caput orbis effecta, latius praesideres religione divina quam dominatione terrena. Quamvis enim multis aucta victoriis ius imperii tui terra marique protuleris, minus tamen est quod tibi bellicus labor subdidit quam quod pax Christiana subiecit[1]. — The correspondence of Leo, if we include certain extraneous elements, amounts to one hundred and seventy-three letters[2]. Of these one hundred and forty-three bear the name of the pope, and cover the period from 442 to 460. They are all official in character; most of them were evidently not written by Leo himself, but are the product of the papal chancery. They deal in great part with canonical or disciplinary questions; some of them are written in defence of the ecclesiastical doctrine concerning the person of our Reedemeer, against the Monophysites; others describe the history of the Robber-Synod of Ephesus, the Council of Chalcedon, and correlated events; others deal with the chronology of Easter, especially the paschal dates for the years 444 and 445, in which there was manifest a divergence between the Roman and the Alexandrine methods of computation. Special mention is owing to the above-mentioned twenty-eighth letter to Flavian of Constantinople, known as the Epistola dogmatica, it was received with enthusiastic praise and applause by the Fathers at Chalcedon, and hailed by them as a faithful expression of the faith of the Church[3] In this letter the pope explains at full length, on the basis of ecclesiastical tradition, and with incomparable clearness and precision, the doctrines of the unity of person and of the duality of natures in the Redeemer, doctrines that had been denied respectively by Nestorius and Eutyches: Ingreditur ergo haec mundi infima filius Dei, de coelesti sede descendens et a paterna gloria non recedens, novo ordine, nova nativitate generatus nec in domino Jesu Christo ex utero virginis genito, quia nativitas est admirabilis, ideo nostri est natura dissimilis. Qui enim verus est Deus, idem verus est homo, et nullum est in hac unitate mendacium, dum invicem sunt et humilitas hominis et altitudo deitatis. Sicut enim Deus non mutatur miseratione, ita homo non consumitur dignitate. Agit enim utraque forma cum alterius communione quod proprium est; Verbo scilicet operante quod Verbi est et carne exsequente quod carnis est. Unum horum coruscat miraculis, aliud succumbit iniuriis. Et sicut Verbum ab aequalitate paternae gloriae non recedit, ita caro naturam nostri generis non relinquit. Unus enim idemque est, quod saepe dicendum est, vere Dei filius et vere hominis filius (c. 4). — In the editions of his works the homilies and letters are followed by writings of

[1] Sermo 82, 1. [2] *Migne,* PL., liv. 581—1218.
[3] Conc. Chalc. Act. ii; *Mansi,* vi. 972.

doubtful provenance; we have already mentioned (§ 95, 5) the *De vocatione omnium gentium* and the letter *Ad Demetriadem*. The *Sacramentarium Leonianum (Liber sacramentorum Romanae ecclesiae)*[1] is the oldest form of the Roman missal or rather the earliest collection of secret prayers said by the celebrant during the Mass. It is certainly of Roman origin, but with equal certainty a private work and not the official publication of any pope. *Duchesne* is of opinion (1889) that it was compiled about the middle of the sixth century; *Probst* maintains (1892) the traditional opinion according to which this collection of Mass-prayers dates from the second half of the fifth century, and is mostly made up of formulae that belong to the time of Leo the Great.

3. LITERATURE OF LEO THE GREAT. — The principal editions of his writings are those of *P Quesnel*, Paris, 1675, 2 vols. (often reprinted), and of the brothers *Pietro* and *Girolamo Ballerini*, Venice, 1753—1757, 3 vols. (*Migne*, PL., liv—lvi). For the contents of these editions and all bibliography to 1794, as well as for the manuscripts then known, cf. *Schoenemann*, Bibl. hist.-lit. Patr. lat., ii. 886—1012 (*Migne*, PL., liv. 64—114). Since the *Ballerini* edition nothing has been added to the writings of Leo. The eight homilies published by *A. B. Caillau* (Ib., lvi. 1131—1154) are certainly spurious. So, too, is the Sermo de ascensione published as a work of Leo by *Fr. Liverani*, Spicilegium Liberianum, Florence, 1863, pp. 121—123. On the other hand, in his work S. Leone Magno e l'Oriente (Rome, 1882; Montecassino, 1890) Don *Ambrogio Amelli* selected from a Latin collection of documents dating back to the Eutychian controversies (§ 114, 3) and published two new letters to Leo, one from Flavian, patriarch of Constantinople, and the other from Eusebius, bishop of Dorylaeum; both of them are appeals to the pope against the Robber-Synod of Ephesus, in which these two bishops had been unjustly deposed. For a new edition of the two letters (from the codex of *Amelli*) cf. *Th. Mommsen*, in Neues Archiv der Gesellschaft für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde (1886), xi. 361—368. These two letters were edited again by *Lacey*, Cambridge, 1903. Two other (Greek and Latin) letters of Flavian to Leo are found among the letters of Leo (22 26) in *Migne*, PL.. liv. 723—732 743—751. There is also a letter of Flavian to the emperor Theodosius II. (*Migne*, PG., lxv. 889—892). We still possess a memorial of Eusebius of Dorylaeum against Eutyches written in 448 (*Mansi*, SS. Conc. Coll. vi. 651 ff.) and a petition to the emperors on the Robber-synod (Ib., vi. 583 f.). For the palæographical (manuscript) tradition of the letters of Leo cf. *R. v. Nostitz-Rieneck*, in Hist. Jahrb. (1897), xviii. 117—133. An excellent edition of the letters relative to the paschal computation is owing to *Br. Krusch*, Studien zur christlich-mittelalterlichen Chronologie, Leipzig, 1880, pp. 251 to 265. For the genuineness of the letters of Leo and other popes concerning the papal vicariate of Thessalonica, as found in the so-called Collectio Thessalonicensis, see *v. Nostitz-Rieneck*, in Zeitschr. für kath. Theol. (1897), xxi. 1—50. Some of the homilies and letters of Leo are reprinted from the *Ballerini* edition in *Hurter*, SS. Patr. opusc. sel. xiv. and xxv to xxvi. All his homilies are translated into German by *M. M. Wilden*, Kempten, 1876 (Bibl. der Kirchenväter), and all his letters by *S. Wenzlowsky*, Die Briefe der Päpste (Bibl. der Kirchenväter), Kempten, 1878,

[1] *Migne*, PL., lv. 21—156.

iv—v. There is an English translation of the homilies and sermons by *Ch. L. Feltoe*, in Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, series ii, vol. xii, New York, 1896. *Feltoe* also edited the Sacramentarium Leonianum, Cambridge, 1897 — For this Sacramentarium cf. *L. Duchesne*, Origines du culte chrétien, Paris, 1889; 2. ed., 1898; 3. ed., 1902. *F. Probst*, Die ältesten römischen Sakramentarien und Ordines erklärt, Münster, 1892. *H. A. Wilson*, The metrical endings of the Leonine Sacramentary, in Journal of Theol. Studies (1904), v. 386—395, and (1905), vi. 381—391. — For the general history of St. Leo see *Ed. Perthel*, Papst Leos I. Leben und Lehren. Ein Beitrag zur Kirchen- und Dogmengeschichte, Jena, 1843. *Fr.* and *P Böhringer*, Die Väter des Papsttums: Leo I. und Gregor I., Stuttgart, 1879 (Die Kirche Christi und ihre Zeugen. New ed.). *C. Bertani*, Vita di S. Leone Magno, pontefice massimo, Monza, 1880—1881, 3 vols. *Ph. Kuhn*, Die Christologie Leos I. d. Gr. in systematischer Darstellung, Würzburg, 1894. *H. Grisar*, Geschichte Roms und der Päpste im Mittelalter, I, Freiburg i. Br., 1898, passim. — There are extant (*Migne*, PL., l. 581 ff.) eight letters of Sixtus III. (432—440) the predecessor of Pope Leo I., in German by *Wenzlowsky* (l. c., iii. 535 ff.) and in English by *Feltoe* (l. c.).

4. ST. PETER CHRYSOLOGUS. — Peter, born about 406 at Forocornelium (Imola), became bishop of Ravenna, it is generally believed about 433. In this Western centre of imperial government he attained a high reputation as a truly great pastor of souls. It is a controverted question whether Ravenna was or was not a metropolitan see before his time. He enjoyed intimate relations with Leo the Great. When Eutyches, the father of the Monophysite heresy. was condemned by the Synod of Constantinople (448), and thereupon sought to deceive public opinion, Peter was one of those whom he approached, but was told by the latter that he ought to obey the instructions of the pope: quoniam beatus Petrus, qui in propria sede et vivit et praesidet, praestat quaerentibus fidei veritatem; nos enim pro studio pacis et fidei extra consensum Romanae civitatis episcopi causas fidei audire non possumus[1] Peter died at Imola, probably about 450. Besides the letter to Eutyches, there are one hundred and seventy-six homilies bearing his name[2]; they were collected by Felix, bishop of Ravenna (707—717). It is almost universally admitted that among them are spurious homilies; on the other hand, besides this collection, some homilies of Peter are current under other names (e. g. the seven homilies in Migne)[3]. The homilies of our Saint are not long; fully one half of them are expositions of biblical texts. The author develops first the literal sense and seeks then for some deeper meaning: quia historica relatio ad altiorem semper est intelligentiam sublimanda[4] He wrote few doctrinal discourses in the strict sense of the word. Those extant treat of the mystery of the Incarnation or denounce the heresies of Arius and Eutyches. Homilies 56—62 are expository of the Apostles' Creed. A series of homilies is devoted

[1] Ep. 25 among the letters of Leo; *Migne*, PL., liv. 739—744.
[2] Ib., lii. 183—666. [3] PL., lii. 665—680. [4] Sermo 36.

to the honor of the Blessed Virgin and of John the Baptist. In all of these discourses a pure ecclesiastical spirit breathes. The style is generally sober and concise: et dicenti et audienti semper generat lassitudo fastidium[1], but occasionally bold and elevated, as in the oft-quoted phrase: qui iocari voluerit cum diabolo, non poterit gaudere cum Christo[2], and often quite popular, for as he remarks: populis populariter est loquendum[3]. Also in the Middle-Ages the homilies of our Saint, as the large number of manuscripts proves, were much in vogue. He is first called Chrysologus by Agnellus, the ninth-century author of the *Liber pontificalis ecclesiae Ravennatis:* pro suis eum eloquiis Chrisologum ecclesia vocavit, id est aureus sermocinator[4], but there is reason, however, to believe that the epithet is contemporaneous with our Saint.

His works were edited by *D. Mita*, Bologna, 1643, and *S. Pauli*, Venice, 1775; the latter edition is reprinted in *Migne*, PL., lii. Sermo 149 (De pace; *Migne*, PL., lii. 598 f.) is rather the work of Severianus of Gabala and is also found among the writings of the latter in *Migne*, PG., lii. 425—428; § 74, 17. In his Spicilegium Liberianum, Florence, 1863, pp. 125—203, *Fr. Liverani* published, from various manuscripts in Italian libraries, variant readings of several sermons of Petrus Chrysologus; he also edited nine new sermons. The fourth of these new sermons: Contra lubrica festa ac pompas (*Liverani*, p. 192 f.) is erroneously included among the writings of Severianus of Gabala (*Migne*, PL., lxv. 27—28; § 74, 17). Selected homilies of our author were translated into German by *M. Held*, Kempten, 1874 (Bibl. der Kirchenväter); cf. *H. Dapper*, Der hl. Petrus Chrysologus, Cologne, 1867. *Fl. v. Stablewski*, Der heilige Kirchenvater Petrus von Ravenna Chrysologus, Posen, 1871. *J. Looshorn*, Der hl. Petrus Chrysologus und seine Schriften, in Zeitschr. f. kath Theol. (1879), iii. 238—265. *C. Weyman*, Zu Petrus Chrysologus, in Philologus (1896), lv. 464—471.

5. ST. MAXIMUS OF TURIN. — There is extant under the name of Maximus, bishop of Turin, a still larger number of homilies. We know with certainty but little concerning his life. In 451 his name is found among those of the dignitaries in a synod of Milan[5], and, in November of 465, he assisted at a Roman synod. The acts of this synod mention among the names of those present, and directly after the name of Pope Hilarius, that of Maximus before all other bishops[6], whence it has been concluded that he was the oldest of the bishops present. His discourses were first edited by Bruni in 1784[7], and are divided with more or less accuracy into: homiliae, sermones, tractatus. There are one hundred and eighteen *homiliae:* De tempore 1—63, De sanctis 64—82, De diversis 83—118; one hundred and sixteen *sermones:* De tempore 1—55, De sanctis 56

[1] Sermo 122. [2] Sermo 155. [3] Sermo 43.
[4] Ed. *Holder-Egger*, p. 310.
[5] *Migne*, PL., liv., 948; *Mansi*, SS. Conc. Coll., vi. 143.
[6] *Mansi*, l. c., vii. 959 965 f. [7] *Migne*, PL., lvii.

to 93, De diversis 94—116, and six *tractatus:* under this latter title (tractatus vi), however, we actually find expositiones de capitulis evangeliorum (1—23). An appendix contains other writings of uncertain authenticity: thirty-one *sermones,* three *homiliae,* and two long *epistolae.* It has been elsewhere shown that many writings, considered by Bruni to be genuine works of Maximus, belong to other writers. His sermons are usually brief, like those of Chrysologus, whom he resembles in the energy and robustness of his style, though sometimes his language is over flowery. In these discourses he appears as a most zealous shepherd of souls, and especially tireless in his opposition to the survivals of paganism and the inroads of heresy. Northern Italy was a kind of refuge for a multitude of sects, against which Maximus defends the teachings of the Church with great clearness and firmness.

For the editions of the homilies of Maximus and the manuscript tradition cf. *Schoenemann,* Bibl. hist.-lit. Patr. lat., ii. 618—669 (*Migne,* PL., lvii. 184—210). The writings and the life of Maximus are described at length by *Fessler-Jungmann,* Instit. Patrol. ii 2, 256—276. The Sermo vii in *Bruni's* appendix (De die dominicae ascensionis) is the Explanatio symboli ad initiandos of St. Ambrose (§ 90, 6 10); cf. *Ferreri,* S. Massimo, vescovo di Torino, e i suoi tempi, 3. ed., Turin, 1868. The episcopate and life of St. Maximus are described by *F. Savio,* Gli antichi vescovi d'Italia (Piemonte), Turin, 1899, pp. 283—294. In this work (pp. 569 to 575) the reader will find an account of the forgeries of Meyranesio, i. e. compositions which he fathered on Maximus.

THIRD PERIOD.

# FROM THE MIDDLE OF THE FIFTH CENTURY TO THE END OF THE PATRISTIC AGE.

## FIRST SECTION.

## GREEK WRITERS.

### § 98. General conspectus.

1. THE DECAY OF ECCLESIASTICAL LEARNING. — After the middle of the fifth century Greek theology enters upon a period of decay. The doctrinal conflicts that centre about the names of Nestorius and Eutyches, tend more and more to serve ecclesiastico-political aims. Interest in ecclesiastical knowledge perishes, while the earlier creative vigor is steadily on the wane. Men are henceforth content with collections of excerpts, with summaries and compilations; it is held sufficient to catalogue the intellectual labors of former days. Early in this period are to be found the still obscure origins of the «Catenae», and of the very intricate literature of the «Florilegia» or «Parallela». Some works of an earlier date, especially homilies, were re-edited in view of actual needs and circumstances; others were fitted out with commentaries. Superior minds, however, were not entirely lacking; a few such rose above the conditions of their own time and produced original writings that still excite astonishment and even admiration. At least one new field of ecclesiastical literature was cultivated with success in this period: rhythmical hymnography, specimens of which we have already met in the fourth and fifth centuries (§ 60, 5). The growing splendor of divine worship acts henceforth as a powerful stimulus in this direction, and ecclesiastical literature is accordingly enriched with productions of the highest merit. It may be added that at no time during the patristic period did ecclesiastical literature sink to so low a level, as profane Greek literature did in the seventh and eighth centuries. While in John of Damascus the Church found a champion who seemed to recall, both in prose and verse, the golden age of the fourth century, profane Greek literature enters upon a desolate period of utter silence. The Damascene, however, is only a transient reflorescence of former intel-

lectual strength; after him Byzantine theology enters upon a period of torpor.

2. DOCTRINAL CONTROVERSIES AND ECCLESIASTICAL LITERATURE; DOGMATIC, POLEMIC, AND APOLOGETIC. — Nestorianism, but more especially Eutychianism, in all their ramifications, furnish henceforth the subject-matter of Greek theology. Both these heresies found their ablest opponent in Leontius of Byzantium, a theological heir of Cyril of Alexandria. Other disputants in these memorable conflicts were Ephræm of Antioch, the emperor Justinian, Anastasius I. of Antioch, Eulogius of Alexandria, Georgius Pisides, Anastasius Sinaita, and John of Damascus. Apollinarianism was again refuted this time by Antipater of Bostra and Leontius of Byzantium (?). Origenism called forth the same Antipater and the emperor Justinian, as well as Barsanuphius and Theodorus of Scythopolis. The Theopaschite and Tritheist disputes did not get beyond certain narrow limits. On the other hand, the controversy of the Three Chapters moved the Church of the West more profoundly than that of the East. Eustratius of Constantinople opposed the theory that after death the soul was in a dormant state. The old Monophysite teachings awoke to a new life in Monotheletism. This new heresy was refuted by Sophronius of Jerusalem and Maximus Confessor, the latter of whom is reckoned among the greatest theologians of the Greek church. The theology of Maximus is based on the writings of the pseudo-Dionysius Areopagita who had undertaken to make the ideas of Neoplatonism subservient to the needs of Christian speculation. The last great doctrinal question to agitate the Greek Church was thrust upon her by the iconoclastic emperor, Leo the Isaurian; the defence of holy images was undertaken by Germanus of Constantinople and John of Damascus. The latter remains to the present day the classic theologian of the Greek Church, all earlier doctrinal material of which is resumed and systematized by him in his «Fountain of Wisdom» Meritorious defenders of Christianity against the attacks of Neoplatonism arose in the persons of Aeneas of Gaza and Zacharias Rhetor. Leontius of Neapolis, Anastasius Sinaita, John of Damascus, and others wrote against the Jews. The Damascene writes also against the Manichæans (Paulicians) and the Saracens.

3. OTHER BRANCHES OF THEOLOGICAL LITERATURE. — *Historical theology*. While in the West ecclesiastical history assumes the character of a lifeless chronicle as early as the fifth century, the Greek church by its writers vigorously sustains throughout the sixth century its reputation for ecclesiastical historiography. Theodorus Lector, Zacharias Rhetor, and Evagrius Scholasticus will always be remembered as ecclesiastical historians. The Chronicon Paschale belongs to the first half of the seventh century. Less valuable is the history of the Nicene Council by Gelasius of Cyzicus; Basil of Seleucia has

left us specimens of biography; he was followed by Cyril of Scythopolis and Leontius of Neapolis; the former wrote for the monks, the latter for the people, while both aimed at edification and practical results. Cosmas Indicopleustes is remembered as a geographer. The province of biblical theology was much less cultivated. Biblical commentaries were composed by Ammonius of Alexandria, Gennadius of Constantinople, Victor of Antioch, and Andrew of Cæsarea. We owe to Procopius of Gaza lengthy Catena-like compilations on several books of the Old Testament. In the fifth book of his «Christian Topography», Cosmas, the Indian traveller, wrote a kind of introduction to the Bible; his commentary on the Canticle of canticles has perished. *Practical* theology is much more copiously represented. We find that many ascetical works were produced by John Climacus, John Moschus, the monk Antiochus, the abbot Dorotheus, Maximus Confessor, John of Damascus, and others. A widely read and authoritative work was the «Ladder» (of heaven) written by John Climacus. The «Spiritual meadow» of John Moschus, a collection of miraculous events and of virtuous lives of contemporary monks, was particularly beloved among works of edification. Collections of homilies are extant under the names of Basil of Seleucia, Sophronius of Jerusalem, Germanus of Constantinople, John of Damascus; the latter three deserve especial mention for their homilies on the Blessed Virgin. In the sixth century systematic collections of canons were made by an anonymous writer and by Johannes Scholasticus; in the seventh and eighth the *Nomocanones* or collections of civil and ecclesiastical laws were compiled. *Sacred poetry*, as already stated (see no. 1), made wonderful progress. Splendid, and in a way incomparable, rhythmic hymns were composed by Romanus the Singer, Sergius of Constantinople, Andrew of Crete, John of Damascus, and Cosmas the Singer. Georgius Pisides, a gifted and productive poet, adhered strictly to quantitative metre.

### § 99. Writers of the second half of the fifth century.

1. BASIL OF SELEUCIA. — This writer was bishop of Seleucia in Isauria. At the Synod of Constantinople (448) held under the presidency of the patriarch Flavian, he voted for the condemnation of the new heresy of Eutychianism or Monophysitism and for the deposition of the archimandrite Eutyches, but at the Robber-Synod of Ephesus (449), the violent Dioscurus of Alexandria so intimidated him that he declared in favor of the rehabilitation of Eutyches and adhered to the Monophysite teaching. He was therefore about to be deposed at the Council of Chalcedon (451), but subscribed the letter of Leo the Great to Flavian (§ 97, 2), condemned Eutyches and Dioscurus, and was forgiven; he never afterwards wavered from orthodox doctrines. There is extant in a Latin translation a letter

of the Isaurian episcopate, written in 458 to the emperor Leo I., and signed by Basil, in which he declares that the authority of Chalcedon must be sustained and the intruded patriarch of Alexandria, Timothy Aelurus, be deposed[1]. It is probable that he did not long survive this act, and that he died in 459. His literary remains consist of 41 discourses *(λόγοι)* on passages from the Old and the New Testament[2] and a long life of the so-called protomartyr Thecla (§ 30, 5) followed by a description of the miracles that took place at her sepulchre in Seleucia[3]. Photius was acquainted with fifteen of these discourses, and blames their lack of simplicity and naturalness, the result of excessive rhetorical ornament; he also calls attention to the affinity between the exegetical method of Basil and that of Chrysostom[4]. The authenticity of most of the sermons has been called in question (§ 77, 11). Photius is witness[5] that Basil wrote also a metrical account *(μέτροις ἐντείνας)* of the conflicts and triumph of St. Thecla.

The attitude of Basil at the above-mentioned councils is described by *Hefele,* Konziliengeschichte, 2. ed., ii. 331 ff. 375 ff. 430 ff. On his writings cf. *Fabricius-Harles,* Bibl. Gr., ix. 90—97 (*Migne,* PG., lxxxv. 9—18). On his Life and Miracles of St. Thecla cf. *Lipsius,* Die apokr. Apostelgeschichten (1887), ii 1, 426 432 f. — The emperor Leo I. (457—474) requested (458) from every bishop of the empire a memorial on the Council of Chalcedon and on Timothy Aelurus. Many of the answers are still extant in a Latin translation made by Epiphanius Scholasticus (§ 115, 3) at the suggestion of Cassiodorius (*Mansi,* l. c., vii. 524—662; *Hefele,* l. c., ii. 420 566). Timothy Aelurus appears to have left many writings, only a few fragments of them have reached us in the original Greek; there is much more, however, in the Syriac translation; cf. *Ahrens* und *Krüger,* Die sogen. Kirchengeschichte des Zacharias Rhetor, Leipzig, 1899, pp. 28—31 38—54 319—322. *W E. Crum,* Eusebius and Coptic Church histories, in Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archæology, London, 1902, xxiv. 1902. Crum recognizes in two manuscripts of a Coptic ecclesiastical history (in twelve books) a work of Timothy Aelurus, attributed to him by John of Majuma (§ 100, 5), and in which he had borrowed much from Eusebius of Cæsarea. *P. Godet,* Basile de Séleucie: Dict. de Théologie, Paris, 1905, ii, c. 459 460.

2. ANTIPATER OF BOSTRA. — Antipater was bishop of Bostra in Arabia, shortly after the Council of Chalcedon, and ranks among the principal ecclesiastics of the Eastern Church. Little is known about his life; of his works also but little has reached us: Fragments of a large work against the Apology for Origen of Pamphilus and Eusebius (§ 45, 1); a brief fragment of a treatise against the Apollinarists; two homilies (on the nativity of St. John the Baptist and on the Annunciation); and insignificant fragments of two other homilies[6]

[1] *Mansi,* SS. Conc. Coll., vii. 559—563.
[2] *Migne,* PG., lxxxv. 27—474. [3] Ib., lxxxv. 477—618.
[4] Bibl. Cod. 168. [5] Ib. [6] *Migne,* PG., lxxxv. 1763—1796.

Cf. *Fabricius-Harles,* Bibl. Gr., x. 518—519 (*Migne,* PG., lxxxv. 1755 to 1758). The Greek text of the homily on St. John the Baptist and the homily on the Annunciation was first edited by *A. Ballerini,* Sylloge monumentorum ad mysterium conceptionis immaculatae Virginis Deiparae illustrandum, Rome, 1856, ii 2, 5—26 445—469. *S. Vailhé,* Antipater de Bostra: Dict. de Théologie, Paris, 1903, i, c. 1440.

3. AMMONIUS OF ALEXANDRIA. — Ammonius, a priest and administrator (oeconomus) of the temporalities of the Alexandrine Church, was the signer of a letter addressed in 458 to the emperor Leo I. by the bishops of Egypt[1] He is very well-known as an exegete, though only fragments of his commentaries have reached us through the «Catenae»; they are taken from his writings on the Psalms, Daniel, Matthew, John, the Acts of the Apostles, and the First of Peter[2]. His identity with the Scholiast Ammonius, so often quoted in the «Catenae», is usually taken for granted, though the matter demands further investigation and proof. Anastasius Sinaita quotes twice[3] from the works of «the Alexandrine Ammonius» against the Monophysite Julian of Halicarnassus. This latter Ammonius cannot be identical with our writer, since Julian belongs to the sixth century.

Julian was bishop of Halicarnassus in Caria, from which about 518 he fled to Alexandria. In that city he opposed the Monophysite Severus of Antioch (§ 102, 2), and maintained that even before the Resurrection the body of Christ was incorruptible, or to speak more particularly that it was not subject to decay (φθορά) at all. His disciples were named by their opponents Aphthartodocetae, as teachers of the incorruptibility of the body of Christ, and Phantasiastae, or teachers of a merely phenomenal body of Christ. A Latin translation of a Commentary of Julian on Job was edited by *G. Genebrardus* in his edition of Origen (Paris, 1574), and has often since been reprinted; the Greek text also is extant in manuscripts. As to the sources of this commentary cf. *H. Usener,* in *H. Lietzmann,* Katenen, Freiburg i. Br., 1897, pp. 28—34. In the Rhein. Mus. f. Phil., new series (1900), lv. 321—340, *Usener* published extracts from the Greek text. Other fragments are found in *Mai,* Spicilegium Romanum (1844), x. 206—211. For the doctrine of Julian see *Fr Loofs,* Leontius von Byzanz, Leipzig, 1887, i. 30—32.

4. GENNADIUS OF CONSTANTINOPLE. — Gennadius I., patriarch of Constantinople (458—471), was, as far as is known, no less sincere an adherent to the orthodox doctrine and no less earnest an opponent of Monophysitism, than his predecessor Anatolius (449—458). In a great synod held at Constantinople (probably in 459) he published an *Epistola encyclica* against the practice of simony in the conferring of holy orders[4]. According to Gennadius of Marseilles[5] he was a *vir lingua nitidus et ingenio acer,* also the author of a commentary on Daniel and of many homilies. Marcellinus Comes asserts[6] that he

[1] *Mansi,* l. c., vii. 530. [2] *Migne,* PG., lxxxv. 1361—1610 1823—1826.
[3] Viae dux, cc. 13 14.
[4] *Migne,* PG., lxxxv. 1613—1622; *Mansi,* l. c., vii. 911—920
[5] De viris ill., c. 90. [6] Chron. ad a. 470.

wrote an exposition of all the Pauline Epistles. All these writings have apparently perished. A certain Gennadius appears occasionally in several Catenae and is often, though with doubtful accuracy, identified with our author. He is quoted with special frequency apropos of Genesis and the Epistle to the Romans[1]

The fragments of Gennadius in *Migne* are all taken from Catenae; the fragments on Genesis from the Catena of Nicephorus on the Octateuch and Kings (Leipzig, 1772—1773), and the fragments on Romans from *J. A. Cramer,* Catenae Graec. Patr. in Nov. Test., Oxford, 1838—1844, iv. 163 ff. For the Epistola encyclica cf. *Hefele,* Konziliengeschichte, 2. ed., ii. 584 f. — In union with Peter Mongus, Monophysite patriarch of Alexandria, Acacius (471—489), the successor of the patriarch Gennadius, induced the emperor Zeno to issue his infamous Henoticon (482). This step, originally calculated to bridge over the chasm between orthodoxy and Monophysitism, led to a conflict between the Churches of Rome and Constantinople that lasted for thirty-five years, 484—519 (the so-called Acacian Schism). A correspondence between Acacius and Peter Mongus preserved in Coptic was published in a French translation by *E. Revillout,* in Revue des questions historiques, Paris, 1877, xxii. 83—134, and, in Coptic and French, by *E. Amélineau,* in Monuments pour servir à l'histoire de l'Egypte chrétienne aux IV^e^ et V^e^ siècles, Paris, 1888, pp. 196—228. Amélineau is right, as against Revillout, in maintaining the spurious character of this correspondence (see § 78, 12). On the other hand, a genuine and complete text of these letters exists in an Armenian translation; cf. Book of Letters, an Armenian work by *J. Ismireanz,* Tiflis, 1901, nn. 61—78.

5. GELASIUS OF CYZICUS. — This writer composed about 475 in Bithynia a history (in three books) of the first ecumenical Council at Nicæa[2] It seems strange that up to the present there should have been published only one fragment of the third book containing three letters or edicts of Constantine the Great. We know but little about Gelasius. Photius[3] found that in several manuscripts he was called bishop of Cæsarea in Palestine. His work is a mere compilation from such earlier Christian historiographers as Eusebius, Socrates, Sozomen and Theodoret. Where his narrative is not sustained by these older writers, it is of doubtful value, and at times positively erroneous.

This history of the Nicene Council is found in the larger collections of the councils, e. g. in *Mansi.* The index of the (manuscript) third book was made known by *Fr. Oehler,* in Zeitschr. f. wissensch. Theol. (1861), iv. 439—442. For a general description of the work cf. *E. Venables,* in *Smith* and *Wace,* A Dictionary of Christian Biography, ii. 621—623.

6. VICTOR OF ANTIOCH. — It was probably in the fifth century that Victor, an otherwise unknown priest of Antioch, compiled a commentary on the Gospel of Mark from older materials of a similar kind illustrative of the Gospels of Matthew, Luke and John. He

[1] *Migne,* PG., lxxxv. 1621—1734.
[2] Ib., lxxxv. 1191—1360. [3] Bibl. Cod. 88.

seems to have made good use of the homilies of St. John Chrysostom, and his work proved very serviceable to later interpreters. His commentary on Jeremias seems to have been similarly constructed, the Catena on Jeremias, edited by *M. Ghisler* (Lyons, 1623), draws largely upon this work of Victor. Judging from the character of his authorities, Victor evidently belongs to the Antiochene school of exegesis.

The commentary of Victor on Mark was first edited, in the original Greek, by *P. Possinus,* Rome, 1673, later on by *Chr. Fr. Matthaei,* Moscow, 1775, and by *J. A. Cramer,* Oxford, 1844 (Catenae Graec. Patr. in Nov. Test., i. 259—447). The edition of Cramer presents the most complete and relatively the most ancient text, the edition of Matthaei a later recension. For the scholia on Jeremias cf. *M. Faulhaber,* Die Propheten-Katenen, Freiburg i. Br., 1899, Biblische Studien, iv. 2—3 107—110 133. — *L. A. Zaccagni* was the first to publish (Rome, 1698), under the name of Euthalius, recensions of the text of the Pauline Epistles, the Acts of the Apostles, and the Catholic Epistles (*Migne,* PG., lxxxv. 619—790; that of the Acts is also Ib., x. 1549—1558). This Euthalius is said to have been an inhabitant of Egypt, to have lived in the latter half of the fifth century, and to have been a deacon, and subsequently a bishop. *J. A. Robinson* has shown, in Texts and Studies, Cambridge, 1895, iii. 3, that this work is the result of gradual formation and is owing to several hands. The work was originally executed in the fourth century, when its biblical texts were subdivided into verses (στίχοι) according to the sense; in the fifth century were added, apparently, the stichometric division, the collation with the Pamphilus-codices (§ 45, 1), and other adminicula; cf. *E. v. Dobschütz,* in Zeitschr. f. Kirchengesch. (1899), xix. 107—154. *J. Armitage Robinson,* Recent Work on Euthalius, in Journal of Theological Studies (1904), pp. 70 to 87 87—90.

### § 100. Pseudo-Dionysius Areopagita.

1. THE WRITINGS OF THE PSEUDO-AREOPAGITE. — According to the unanimous evidence of the manuscripts, Dionysius Areopagita is the name of the author of a number of theological works that, generally speaking, appear to be the compositions of a single writer; this is evident from the identity and continuity of certain fundamental theological and philosophical ideas, and from quite inimitable peculiarities of tone and style. The works are fourteen in number: four large treatises and ten letters, of which most are very short. The first four of these letters are addressed to the «Therapeuta» Caius, the fifth to the «Liturgus» Dorotheus, the sixth to the priest *(ἱερεύς)* Sosipater, the seventh to the «Hierarch» Polycarp, the eighth to the «Therapeuta» Demophilus, the ninth to the «Hierarch» Titus, and the tenth to the «Theologian» Johannes. The contents of nearly all the letters is theological; they are answers to questions concerning Catholic doctrine; some contain practical directions and exhortations concerning the conduct to be observed towards infidels (Ep. vii), on mildness and humility (Ep. viii), and on other points. The four large treatises are all dedicated to his co-presbyter *(συμπρεσβύτερος)* Timo-

theus. The work on «The Divine Names» *(περὶ θείων ὀνομάτων)*, the basis of the so-called Areopagitica, treats of the names of God that occur in the Scriptures, and illustrates through them the nature and attributes of the divinity. The work on Mystical Theology *(περὶ μυστικῆς θεολογίας)* demonstrates that it is impossible to comprehend the divine nature and likewise impossible fully to express or to define it. The work on «The Celestial Hierarchy» *(περὶ τῆς οὐρανίας ἱεραρχίας)* describes the gradation of the heavenly spirits; it distinguishes three hierarchies or classes: Seraphim, Cherubim, and Thrones; Dominations, Virtues and Powers; Principalities, Archangels and Angels. The work on «The Ecclesiastical Hierarchy» *(περὶ τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς ἱεραρχίας)* describes the Church as an earthly image of the heavenly world, to the above-mentioned three heavenly hierarchies correspond as many triads on earth: Consecrations (Baptism, Eucharist and Confirmation); Consecrators (Bishop, Priest and Deacon); Consecrated (Monks, Laity, and those in a state of purification). The writer repeatedly refers to other writings already published by him; among them he quotes one on the elements of theology *(θεολογικαὶ ὑποτυπώσεις)*[1], another on the attributes and ranks of the angels *(περὶ τῶν ἀγγελικῶν ἰδιοτήτων καὶ τάξεων)*[2], one on the soul *(περὶ ψυχῆς)*[3], one on the just and divine judgment *(περὶ δικαίου καὶ θείου δικαιωτηρίου)*[4], and others. It must be said, however, that these statements of the author concerning his own writings are both obscure and contradictory, and that no other traces of his literary productions have yet been discovered. The Syriac translation of the Areopagitica made by Sergius of Resaina († 536 contains only the four treatises and the letters, as handed down in the Greek text. There are extant three letters to Apollophanes, Timotheus, and Titus, that have come down in other than Greek texts, but they are spurious, i. e. are falsely accredited to the author of the Areopagitica.

Very little has been done hitherto for the textual criticism of this writer. Only a few of the (numerous) Greek manuscripts have been consulted, while the Oriental translations (Syriac, Armenian, Arabic) await both the printer and the investigator. The Greek text was published Florence 1516, Paris 1562, Antwerp 1634, Paris 1644 by *B. Corderius*, S. J., 2 vols.; Venice, 1755—1756, 2 vols.; this last edition in *Migne*, PG., iii—iv. *J. G. V Engelhardt* translated all the works of Dionysius into German, Sulzbach, 1823, 2 vols. The English translation of *J. Parker* (Oxford, 1897) is a more accurate and trustworthy piece of work. The De ecclesiastica hierarchia was translated into German by *R. Storf*, Kempten, 1877 (Bibl. der Kirchenväter). Cf. *A. Jahn*, Dionysiaca. Sprachliche und sachliche platonische Blütenlese aus Dionysius, dem sogen. Areopagiten, Altona and Leipzig, 1889. — For the statements of the Pseudo-Areopagite concerning his own literary labors cf. *H. Koch*, in Theol. Quartalschr. (1895), lxxvii. 362—371; also Röm. Quartalschr. (1898), xii. 364—367. —

[1] De div. nom. 1, 1 5 al. [2] Ib., 4, 2. [3] Ib.
[4] Ib 4, 35.

The spurious letter to the philosopher Apollophanes (cf. Ep. 7, 2—3) is found in Latin in *Migne,* PG., iii. 1119—1122. The letter to Timotheus on the death of the Apostles Peter and Paul is extant in Syriac, Armenian and Latin translations in *Pitra,* Analecta sacra, iv 241—254 261—276; cf. *Vetter,* Das apokryphe Schreiben Dionysius des Areopagiten an Titus über die Aufnahme Mariä, aus dem Armenischen übersetzt, in Theol. Quartalschr. (1887), lxix. 133—138.

2. AUTHORSHIP OF THE AREOPAGITICA. — The writer calls himself Dionysius [1], and apparently desires to pass for Dionysius the Areopagite, disciple of the Apostle of the Gentiles [2] and first bishop of Athens [3]. He takes pleasure in declaring that St. Paul is his master in the mysteries of Christianity [4], and addresses his treatises and letters to disciples of the apostles: Timotheus, Titus, Caius [5], Sosipater [6], and Polycarp. The tenth letter is addressed: «To the Theologian Johannes, the Apostle and Evangelist, in his exile on the island of Patmos.» Dionysius was an eye-witness of «the eclipse of the sun in the redeeming Cross» *(τῆς ἐν τῷ σωτηρίῳ σταυρῷ γεγουυίας ἐκλείψεως)* [7] i. e. the solar eclipse that took place at the death of Christ. He says, he beheld it at Heliopolis, but does not make clear whether he means the town of that name in Coelesyria or the one in Lower Egypt. Accompanied by many brethren he undertook a journey «to behold the life-begetting and God-receiving body *(ἐπὶ τὴν θέαν τοῦ ζωαρχικοῦ καὶ θεοδόχου σώματος)*»; he means, apparently, that he assisted at the death of the Mother of God; «there were also present James the brother of God *(ὁ ἀδελφόθεος)* and Peter, the most eminent and the oldest Chiefs of the theologians» [8]. These and other passages from our author's treatises and letters led ecclesiastical writers of the sixth century to bestow on him the title of «Areopagite», «disciple of the apostles», and the like. The first public mention of his works was made at the religious conference that took place in 531 or 533 at Constantinople between the orthodox Catholics and the Severiani or moderate Monophysites. The latter appealed for their doctrine to the writings of Dionysius the Areopagite; the Catholic representative, Hypatius of Ephesus, rejected them as spurious: Illa enim testimonia, quae vos Dionysii Areopagitae dicitis, unde potestis ostendere vera esse? [9] In spite of this attitude, the works of our author gradually obtained esteem and influence even among Catholics, owing particularly to Maximus Confessor († 662) who wrote commentaries on them and defended them from the charges of Monophysitism. Throughout the mediæval period no one doubted that the author was Dionysius the Areopagite. In 827 the Greek emperor Michael Balbus presented to

[1] Ep. 7, 3. [2] Acts xvii. 34. [3] *Eus.,* Hist. eccl., iii 4, 10.
[4] De div. nom. 2, 11; 3, 2 al. [5] Rom. xvi. 23; 1 Cor. i. 14.
[6] Rom. xvi. 21. [7] Ep. 7, 2. [8] De div. nom. 3, 2.
[9] *Mansi,* SS. Conc. Coll., viii. 821.

Louis the Pious a copy of these works. A Latin translation executed by Hilduin, abbot of St. Denis (near Paris), being found unsatisfactory, Charles the Bald commissioned the Irish monk John Scotus Erigena to make another. Thenceforth the writings exercised a far-reaching influence on Western theological science. They were as a lamp to mystic theologians along the obscure paths of contemplation and ecstasy; scholastic writers looked to them for guidance in their speculations concerning the nature and attributes of the divinity, the first ideal causes of creation, and the ranks of the heavenly spirits; ascetic writers were instructed by them concerning the triple way of purification, illumination and union, exegetical and liturgical writers found in them the ideal presentation of scriptural doctrine and ecclesiastical ritual. With the decay of mediæval life came also a decline in the reputation of the Areopagitica. One of the first manifestations of the newly awakened spirit of criticism was a renewal of the protest long before made by Hypatius at Constantinople. Heated and wearisome controversies followed in the course of which were brought forth countless hypotheses concerning the true authorship of these problematic writings: Greek, Syrian, Latin, orthodox and heretical writers, even pagan priests of Dionysos (i. e. Bacchus) were each in turn proposed as the author of them; it was always taken for granted that, if the author were not Dionysius the Areopagite, he was a forger and a deceiver. The first to modify this alternative was Hipler; he undertook (1861) to prove that our author himself did not claim to be the Areopagite; Hipler said it was an error to seek in Dionysius the person of the Areopagite, it was owing to this mistaken notion that in course of time the originally obscure text continually became more disfigured and corrupted while in its turn this faulty text served as a prop for other erroneous hypotheses, there was no reason to suspect what the author says about himself, he was a teacher in an Egyptian catechetical school, during the latter half of the fourth century[1] and may probably be identified with the monk and catechist, Dionysius at Rhinocorura, mentioned by Sozomen[2]. Many theological scholars, like Dräseke and Nirschl, were persuaded that the keen reasoning of Hipler had solved the problem, and agreed with the latter that the qualification of «Pseudo-Areopagite» was an injustice. Other writers continued to maintain that the Areopagitica were nothing more than a composition written under an assumed name, and in reality dating from about the end of the fifth century. In the last few years the brilliant investigations of Stiglmayr and Koch have raised this thesis to the level of certitude, and put an end for ever to a long-lingering controversy.

[1] Cf. Ep. 7, 2; De div. nom. 3, 2.

[2] Hist. eccl., vi. 31.

There exists as yet no complete history of the Areopagitica, their diffusion and their influence. Cf. *J. Stiglmayr,* Das Aufkommen der Pseudo-Dionysischen Schriften und ihr Eindringen in die christliche Literatur bis zum Laterankonzil 649 (Progr.), Feldkirch, 1895. *N. Nilles,* in Zeitschr. für kath. Theol. (1896), xx. 395—399. *Stiglmayr,* in Hist. Jahrbuch (1898), xix. 91—94; (1899), xx. 367—388. *R. Foss,* Über den Abt Hilduin von St. Denis und Dionysius Areopagita (Progr.), Berlin, 1886. *J. Dräseke,* in Zeitschr. für wissenschaftl. Theol. (1892), xxxv. 408—418. *H. Omont,* Manuscrit des œuvres de S. Denys l'Aréopagite, envoyé de Constantinople à Louis le Débonnaire en 827, Paris, 11 pp., with a fac-simile. The earlier literature is very extensive and may be studied in *Chevalier,* Bio-Bibliographie, pp. 563—565 2549. The most recent works are quoted below no. 3. The authorship of the Areopagite is still maintained by Josephus a Leonissa in various articles, in Jahrbuch für Philosophie und spekulative Theologie (1902), xvi; (1903), xvii. 419—454.

3. ACTUAL STATUS OF THE QUESTION. — The hypothesis of Hipler is now looked on as a failure. He sustained it only by means of many modifications of the text which, as more recent palæographical investigations have shown, do violence to the authentic tradition of our author's text. There is no reason for changing the words of the passages (no. 2) already quoted. Hipler was wrong in attempting to make us read *ἐκλάμψεως*, instead of *ἐκλείψεως*[1] which is found in all the printed editions; similarly we must read with all former editors *σώματος* and *ἀδελφόθεος*, not *σήματος* and *ἀδελφός*[2]. It follows at once that the author set up for a contemporary of the apostles, that he put on a mask for the purpose of deceit. The opinion that he was really the Areopagite, or any other disciple of the apostles, was rightly put aside many years ago by Hipler, and has been even more thoroughly refuted since his time, a result owing in no small degree to the scientific naïveté of its recent defenders (C. M. Schneider, J. Parker, and others). Internal and external criteria enable us to fix the date of composition of the Areopagitica between the end of the fifth and the beginning of the sixth century; the earliest traces of these are not found, as Hipler imagined, at the end of the fourth century, but at the beginning of the sixth, as quotations in the writings of Severus, the Monophysite patriarch of Antioch about 512—518 (although his writings cannot be dated with absolute exactness), or in the quotations made from the Areopagitica by Andrew, archbishop of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, in his commentary on the Apocalypse, composed probably about 520. On the other hand, the Areopagitica cannot have been published before the end of the fifth century. The author is quite familiar with the works of the Neoplatonist Proclus (411—485), and has greatly profited by them. Both Stiglmayr and Koch have shown that *De div. nom.* iv, 18—34, is an extract from Proclus' treatise *De malorum subsistentia,* which has reached us only in a Latin translation. The

[1] Ep. 7, 2. [2] De div. nom. 3, 2.

author is also acquainted with the liturgical custom of singing the Credo during the Mass[1]. This was first done by the Monophysites at Antioch in 476; the Catholics soon afterwards adopted its introduction into the liturgy The author is also very probably influenced by the Henoticon of the emperor Zeno (482), the document by which he hoped to bring about a reconciliation of the orthodox believers and the Monophysites. A pacifying tone pervades the Areopagitica; it is evident that they deliberately avoid the disputed terms *μία φύσις* and *δύο φύσεις*; in general the Christology of their author is expressed in such vague and indefinite phrases that there is no reason to wonder why both parties laid claim to him as to a witness to the truth of mutually conflicting doctrines. The expression *θεανδρικὴ ἐνέργεια*[2] acquired considerable celebrity later on. He was very probably a native of Syria, not of Egypt. Krüger called attention to the scholasticus Dionysius of Gaza, a friend of Petrus Iberus, the Monophysite bishop of Majuma near Gaza, who died about 487. But though our writer adopted the name of Dionysius in his writings, there is no proof that such was really his name. It is conjectured that in his early youth he must have been a Neoplatonist; he says of himself[3] that he had been born a heathen. In any case the peculiar or distinctive note of his exposition of ecclesiastical teaching and life is found in his manifold and profound Neoplatonic reminiscences. He loves to dwell with endless variety on the idea of the One *(ἕν)*, the procession of all things from Him *(πρόοδος)*, and their return to Him *(ἐπιστροφή)*. He is not so original an author as has long been believed. «He stands close by the current of ecclesiastical tradition from which his extensive erudition permits him to drink in copious draughts», says Stiglmayr. In his pages, however, the ancient tradition sparkles and scintillates in new and strange colors. In his discourse he draws constantly on the terminology of the pagan mysteries; he delights in capricious formation of new words; the structure of his sentence is affected and overcrowded. As Stiglmayr says, «he delights in conscious and intentional artificiality and obscurity of diction»

*Fr. Hipler,* Dionysius, der Areopagite. Untersuchungen über Echtheit und Glaubwürdigkeit der unter diesem Namen vorhandenen Schriften, Ratisbon, 1861. *Id.,* De theologia librorum qui sub Dionysii Areopagitae nomine feruntur. 4 programs of the Lycæum Hosianum at Brunsberg, 1871—1885. The often quoted passage from De div. nom. 3, 2 is found in a Syriac translation (from three codices) in *P. de Lagarde,* Mitteilungen, Göttingen, 1891, iv. 19 f. Cf. *H. Gelzer,* in Jahrb. für protest. Theol. (1892), xviii. 457—459; for the passage from. Ep. 7, 2 cf. *Id.,* in Wochenschrift für klass. Philol. (1892), pp. 98—100 124—127. *J. Stiglmayr,* Der Neuplatoniker Proklus als Vorlage des sogen. Dionysius Areopagita in der Lehre vom Übel, in Hist. Jahrb. (1895), xvi. 253—273 721—748; *Id.,* Das

[1] De eccl. hier., 3. 2. [2] Ep. 4. [3] De coel. hier., 9, 3.

Aufkommen der Pseudo-Dionysischen Schriften, see no. 2. *H. Koch,* Der pseudepigraphische Charakter der dionysischen Schriften, in Theol. Quartalschrift (1895), lxxvii. 353—420, and (1896), lxxviii. 290—298; *Id.,* Proklus als Quelle des Pseudo-Dionysius Areopagita in der Lehre vom Bösen, in Philologus (1895), liv. 438—454; *Id.,* Pseudo-Dionysius Areopagita in seinen Beziehungen zum Neuplatonismus und Mysterienwesen, in Forschungen zur christl. Literatur- und Dogmengeschichte, Mainz, 1900, i. 2—3. The results of *Stiglmayr* and *Koch* were challenged particularly by *J. Dräseke* and *J. Nirschl. Stiglmayr* replied in Byzant. Zeitschr. (1898), vii. 91—110 (cf. [1899], viii. 263—301), and *Koch,* in Röm. Quartalschr. (1898), xii. 353—398. *G. Krüger,* Wer war Pseudo-Dionysius? in Byzant. Zeitschr. (1899), viii. 302—305. *O. Siebert,* Die Metaphysik und Ethik des Pseudo-Dionysius Areopagita (Inaug.-Diss.), Jena, 1894. *Stiglmayr,* Die Engellehre des sogen. Dionysius Areopagita, in Compte-rendu du IV Congrès scient. internat. des Cathol., Freiburg (Switzerland), 1898, sect. I, pp. 403—414; *Id.,* Die Lehre von den Sakramenten und der Kirche nach Pseudo-Dionysius, in Zeitschr. f. kath. Theol. (1898), xxii. 246—303; cf. pp. 180—187; *Id.,* Die Eschatologie des Pseudo-Dionysius, ib. (1899), xxiii. 1—21. For penance in Pseudo-Dionysius see *Koch,* in Hist. Jahrb. (1900), xxi. 58—78; cf. *Stiglmayr,* in Zeitschr. f. kath. Theol. (1900), xxiv 657—671.

4. HIEROTHEUS. — The author of the Areopagitica refers often with enthusiasm to a certain Hierotheus as his venerable master; he also mentions (De div. nom. ii. 9—10, and iv. 14—17) two works of Hierotheus: Elements or foundations of theology: θεολογικαὶ στοιχειώσεις (De div. nom. 2, 9—10), and Hymns of love: ἐρωτικοὶ ὕμνοι (ib., 4, 14—17). His own works, he says, serve merely to illustrate and complete his master's writings, which are not easily understood by reason of their profundity and conciseness (De div. nom. 3, 2—3; De coel. hier. 6, 2). Is this Hierotheus an historical person or a fiction of our author? There is extant in Syriac a «Book of St. Hierotheos on the hidden mysteries of the divinity», which *A. L. Frothingham* jun. (Stephen Bar Sudaili, the Syrian mystic, and the book of Hierotheos, Leyden, 1886) ascribes to the monk Stephen Bar Sudaili who lived about 500, and which is held by Frothingham to be the source whence the writings of the pseudo-Areopagite were drawn. In the present state of the question it is more natural to think that the assertions of the Pseudo-Areopagite suggested to some Syrian writers the composition of a «Book of St. Hierotheos».

5. VITA PETRI IBERIS. — About the year 500 a Greek biography of Petrus Iber was composed. It has been edited in Syriac and German translations by *R. Raabe,* Leipzig, 1895; cf. *J. B. Chabot,* in Revue de l'Orient latin (1895), iii. 367—397. This biography is supplemented by a work entitled «Plerophoriae», anecdotes gathered about 515 by Johannes, bishop of Majuma, friend and disciple of Peter. These anecdotes have been edited in French by *F. Nau,* in Revue de l'Orient chrétien (1898), iii. 232—259 337—392, and separately, Les Plérophories de Jean, évêque de Maiouma, Paris, 1899.

### § 101. Procopius of Gaza and Aeneas of Gaza.

1. PROCOPIUS. — The sophist-schools of Hellenism were already on the decline when the schools of the Syrian city of Gaza, favored by various circumstances, entered upon a brief period of prosperity. A multitude of noble youths came thither from the remotest quarters for the study of eloquence, then a usual preliminary to all special

studies. All the known sophists of Gaza in the fifth and sixth centuries are Christian, though their rhetorical works might well have been written by pagans. Two of them, however, are men of earnestness and conviction; we owe to them commentaries on the Holy Scripture and apologetic works. The most brilliant of these Gazan sophists is Procopius, whose life falls into the period between 465 and 528. Antioch, Tyre and Cæsarea tempted him in vain to abandon his native town; the famous orator and teacher ignored their seductions and after a brief absence settled permanently in Gaza, where he devoted himself without interruption to learned studies. His copious correspondence bewrays the rhetorician in its tendency and coloring[1], similarly his panegyric on the emperor Anastasius (491—518), written between 512 and 515[2]. Other writings of this kind have perished or have not yet been recovered. For chronological reasons he cannot be the author of a description of the new Sancta Sophia, finished in 537—538[3], nor of a lament for its destruction by an earthquake in 558[4]. Procopius consigned the results of his theological studies to a series of commentaries on the Old Testament. It is supposed that we have lost his comprehensive work on the Octateuch, one of the earliest specimens of the «Catenae». In it he had collected, without systematic order, a great many quotations from all kinds of authors. It is highly probable that this work was the basis of the Catena on the Octateuch (and the four Books of Kings) published at Leipzig, 1772—1773, by the Greek Nicephorus, in two folio volumes. An extract from this larger work, executed by Procopius himself, was edited in 1555 in a Latin translation; only portions of the Greek text have hitherto been published[5]. This extract is also a Catena-commentary, though it differs from the other works of that kind in the anonymous character of its quotations, nor does it give the complete comment of the authors quoted, but only extracts therefrom. Eisenhofer has shown that the authors most copiously drawn on are Cyril of Alexandria, Gregory of Nyssa, and Basil the Great. Procopius gave also a Catena-like character to his lengthy commentary on Isaias[6]. Theodoret of Cyrus furnishes the greater part of the scholia to the four Books of Kings and the two Books of Paralipomenon[7]. Paraphrases of the three Solomonic books, current under the name of Procopius, are only partially published, they are a commentary on Proverbs[8], a fragment of a Catena on Proverbs[9], a Catena on the Canticle of canticles[10], and a fragment of a commentary on the same[11]. All of them await a closer investigation of their

[1] *Migne,* PG., lxxxvii 2, 2717—2792 f. [2] Ib., lxxxvii 3, 2793—2826.
[3] Ib., lxxxvii 3, 2827—2838. [4] Ib., lxxxvii 3, 2839—2842.
[5] Ib., lxxxvii 1, 21—1080. [6] Ib., lxxxvii 2, 1817—2718.
[7] Ib., lxxxvii 1, 1079—1220. [8] Ib., lxxxvii 1, 1221—1544.
[9] Ib., lxxxvii 2, 1779—1800. [10] Ib., lxxxvii 1, 1545—1754.
[11] Ib., lxxxvii 1, 1755—1780.

origin. A fragment of a polemical work against the Neoplatonist Proclus[1] is identical with a chapter of Nicholas, bishop of Methone, against Proclus, written at the end of the twelfth century. We cannot admit, with Dräseke, that we have here a new and unmodified edition of a work of Procopius, and think it probable, with Stiglmayr, that the fragment is wrongly attributed to our author.

The only complete edition of the works of Procopius is in *Migne*, PG., lxxxvii, parts 1—3. His correspondence was edited anew by *R. Hercher*, Epistolographi Graeci, Paris, 1873, pp. 533—598; a letter, lacking in Hercher, is found in *Fabricius-Harles*, Bibl. Gr., ix. 296. Three other unedited letters were published by *N. Festa*, Animadversiones criticae in Procopii Gazaei epistulas, in Bessarione v (1900—1901), vol. viii, 36—42; cf. *L. Galante*, Contributo allo studio delle epistole di Procopio di Gaza, in Studi Italiani di filologia classica (1901), ix. 207—236. For recent researches on the sources of the exegetical writings of Procopius cf. *L. Eisenhofer*, Procopius von Gaza, Freiburg i. Br., 1897. The Catena on Proverbs only partially published, is discussed by *E. Bratke*, in Zeitschr. f. wissenschaftliche Theol. (1896), xxxix. 303—312; on the Catena on the Canticle of canticles see *Zahn*, Forschungen zur Gesch. des neutestamentl. Kanons etc. (1883), ii. 239 ff.; on the fragment against Proclus cf. *D. Russos*, Τρεῖς Γαζαῖοι (Inaug.-Diss.), Constantinople, 1893, pp. 57—69; *J. Dräseke*, in Byzant. Zeitschr. (1897), vi. 55—91; *J. Stiglmayr*, ib. (1899), viii. 263—301. *E. Lindi*, Die Oktateuchkatene des Prokop von Gaza und die Septuagintaforschung, Munich, 1902; this work treats of important manuscript-traces of the larger work of Procopius on the Octateuch, and discussess its biblical text. On the life of Procopius see *J. Seitz*, Die Schule von Gaza (Inaug.-Diss.), Heidelberg, 1892, pp. 9—21; cf. *C. Kirsten*, Quaestiones Choricianae (Breslauer philol. Abhandlungen vii. 2), 1895, pp. 8 ff. — The new church of Sancta Sophia was consecrated Dec. 24., 563, and the solemnity was celebrated by Paulus Silentiarius in a description of the Church and the pulpit (ἄμβων), written in fluent hexameters and very precious for the history of ecclesiastical art (*Migne*, PG., lxxxvi 2, 2119—2158 2251 to 2264). *J. J. Kreutzer*, Paulus des Silentiariers Beschreibung der Haghia Sophia, Leipzig, 1875. Paulus also wrote a lyric carmen on the Pythic hot springs of Bithynia (*Migne*, l. c., 2263—2268). For other works of Paulus see *J. Merian-Genast*, De Paulo Silentiario Byzantino Nonni sectatore (Diss. Inaug.), Leipzig, 1889.

2. AENEAS OF GAZA. — The distinguished and contemporary rhetorician Aeneas was the magnet that attracted to Gaza a body of students at once select and numerous. Aeneas seems to have been born a little earlier than Procopius and to have outlived him. He owes his mediæval fame to an anti-Neoplatonist dialogue written before 534: «Theophrastus, or on the immortality of the soul and the resurrection of the body»[2]. Twenty-five short letters (lacking in *Migne*) are much more attractive as specimens of contemporary Hellenic literature.

The last separate edition of the «Theophrastus» dialogue is that of *J. Fr. Boissonade*, Paris, 1836. The Greek text of this edition is accompanied by the Latin translation of Ambrosius Camaldulensis († 1439).

[1] Ib., lxxxvii 2, 2792 e—h. [2] Ib., lxxxv. 871—1004.

The letters were re-edited by *Hercher,* l. c., pp. 24—32. Cf. *D. Russos,* Τρεῖς Γαζαῖοι (Inaug.-Diss.), Constantinople, 1893. *G. Schalkhausser,* Äneas von Gaza als Philosoph (Inaug.-Diss.), Erlangen, 1898.

3. JOHANNES PHILOPONUS. — The theological labors of the Alexandrine grammarian Johannes were less successful. He was a younger contemporary and colleague of the above-mentioned sophists, and his untiring activity earned for him the name of Philoponus (φιλόπονος). His most important work bears the title of «The arbiter» (διαιτητής); it is a dialectico-speculative discussion of the doctrine concerning Christ and the Trinity, and is written in favor of Monophysitism and Tritheism. Only fragments of the work have reached us. According to his opponent Leontius of Byzantium (De sectis; cf. § 102, 1) our writer maintained that there were τρεῖς μερικαὶ οὐσίαι in God, and one οὐσία κοινή, the latter existent only as an abstraction. He also wrote a (lost) work on the resurrection of the body (περὶ ἀναστάσεως), in which he denied the absolute identity of our actual bodies with those of the resurrection. There are extant a work of Philoponus on the creation of the world: De aeternitate mundi contra Proclum, last edited by *H. Rabe,* Leipzig, 1899; a commentary on the biblical account of creation: De opificio mundi libri vii, last edited by *G. Reichardt,* Leipzig, 1897; and a Libellus de paschate, edited by *C. Walter,* Jena, 1899. For other details concerning his theological writings cf. *Stöckl,* in Wetzer und Weltes Kirchenlexikon, 2. ed., vi. 1748—1754. Concerning his theological doctrine see *J. M. Schönfelder*, Die Kirchengeschichte des Johannes von Ephesus, Munich, 1862, pp. 267—311: «Die Tritheïten». Among the celebrated writers of the Tritheïsts was Stephen Gobarus (about 600), known to us now only through an excerpt from his principal work preserved by Photius (Bibl. Cod. 232).

4. ANONYMI HERMIPPUS DE ASTROLOGIA DIALOGUS. — About 500, apparently, a Neoplatonist Christian published a dialogue in two books entitled «Hermippus or concerning Astrology». In it he maintained that the latter was compatible with Christian faith. It was edited by *O. D. Bloch,* Kopenhagen, 1830, and by *W Kroll* and *P. Viereck,* Leipzig, 1895. The author is unknown. Cf. *A. Elter,* in Byzant. Zeitschr. (1897), vi. 164 f.; *Krumbacher,* ib. (1898), vii. 460; *J. Dräseke,* in Zeitschr. f. wissenschaftl. Theol. (1900), xliii. 613—625.

### § 102. Leontius of Byzantium and the emperor Justinian.

1. LEONTIUS OF BYZANTIUM. — Formerly the personality and literary labors of Leontius of Byzantium were very imperfectly known; much light has been thrown on both by the recent researches of Loofs. Leontius was born apparently about 485, perhaps in Scythia, but more probably at Byzantium. He was certainly of noble descent, for he was a relative of the great general Vitalian. His own words[1] lead us to think that he put on the monastic habit while quite young. He tells us in the same place that when a young man he resolved to acquire a thorough knowledge of the doctrines of the Church, and that he took a very lively interest in all the dogmatic discussions of the time. In Scythia he fell into the snares of Nestorianism, but was freed from them by his intercourse with the learned men whom he met during his travels; thenceforth he was a loyal

[1] Adv. Nest. et Eut iii.

defender of the doctrines of the Council of Chalcedon. He appeared at Constantinople and Rome in 519 in the company of certain monks of Scythia who maintained the proposition that «one of the Trinity had suffered in the flesh». A little later we find him in retirement in the so-called New Laura (a village-like colony of hermits in the vicinity of Jerusalem). In 531 he took part in the conference that Justinian had arranged at Constantinople between the Catholics and the Severians, and probably he spent the following years at the capital. In 558 he appears again in his cloister near Jerusalem. Once more, perhaps in 542, he returned to Constantinople, where he died, apparently about 543, and before the first edict of Justinian against the Three Chapters (see no. 3). His oscillation between Constantinople and Jerusalem is sufficient to explain the titles of *monachus Hierosolymitanus* and *monachus Byzantinus* by which he is frequently designated. — Leontius is the author of «three books against the Nestorians and the Eutychians: *λόγοι γ' κατὰ Νεστοριανῶν καὶ Εὐτυχιανιστῶν*[1], composed, according to intrinsic evidence, between 529 and 544. The first book is directed at once against both heresies; he explains that though mutually contradictory, they may be refuted simultaneously, since they take their rise from the same false hypotheses, however far apart the conclusions at which they arrive: *δύο ὑποστάσεις, μία φύσις*. The second book is devoted to the overthrow of the Eutychian or Monophysite heresy, and more particularly of the doctrine of the Julianists or Aphthartodocetes (§ 99, 3). A Catholic and an Aphthartodocete are introduced as the interlocutors in the dialogue. The entire work is admirably executed, and reveals at once an acute mind and an extensive knowledge of Christian literature. In the preface he describes as follows the order and development of the dispute: «I shall first demonstrate the thesis that the nature of the divinity of Christ and the nature of His humanity existed and continued to exist after the Union; afterwards I shall treat of the mutual relations of these two natures and of their modes of existence». The third book is written against the Nestorians and is more historical than polemical in character; in it he is specially intent on exhibiting the dogmatic and exegetic heresies of Theodore of Mopsuestia. Loofs is of opinion that he wrote against the above-mentioned heresies another and no less important work known as: *σχόλια*. The homonymous work current under the name of Leontius, known as *De sectis*[2], is in Loofs' opinion only a later edition of the original composition; similarly in the works commonly entitled *Adversus Nestorianos* and *Contra Monophysitas*[3] Loofs recognizes only later elaborations of separate sections of the original *σχόλια*. Fragments of the original work are

[1] *Migne*, PG., lxxxvi 1, 1267—1396. [2] Ib., lxxxvi 1, 1193—1268.
[3] Ib., lxxxvi 1, 1399—1768, and lxxxvi 2, 1769—1901.

also to be recognized, Loofs thinks, in some quotations from it in the compilation known as: Antiquorum patrum doctrina de Verbi incarnatione[1]; in the «Confutation of the arguments of Severus»: *ἐπίλυσις τῶν ὑπὸ Σευήρου προβεβλημένων συλλογισμῶν*[2] (a genuine work of Leontius), and in the «Thirty theses against Severus»: *τριάκοντα κεφάλαια κατὰ Σευήρου*[3] (likewise a work of Leontius in substance at least). The existence of such a work of Leontius, as Loofs has outlined, and bearing the title of *σχόλια*, is denied by several critics; their objections, however, do not affect the catalogue of the writings of Leontius as drawn up by Loofs. — The latter ascribes to an elder contemporary of Leontius the authorship of the treatise known as: Adversus fraudes Apollinistarum[4]. This remarkable little work was written to show that several quotations from Gregory Thaumaturgus, Athanasius and Pope Julius I., which the Monophysite heretics made use of in their disputes with the Catholics, were really taken from the works of Apollinaris of Laodicea and maliciously attributed to the aforesaid venerable Fathers by Apollinarists or Eutychians or followers of Dioscurus. Modern critical research has amply confirmed these assertions (§ 61, 4). — Most of the above-mentioned writings were first edited by Cardinal *A. Mai* in the original Greek; he declared Leontius to be the foremost theologian of his epoch: in theologica scientia aevo suo facile princeps. The Christology of Leontius is that of Cyril of Alexandria. It is in his writings that the term *ἐνυπόστατος* is first met with. The human nature of Christ, he says, is not *ἀνυπόστατος*, nor even *ὑπόστασις*, but *ἐνυπόστατος*[5] i. e. *ἐν τῷ λόγῳ ὑποστᾶσα*[6]. It is doubtful whether our Leontius, as Loofs thinks, should be identified with a monk of the same name in Jerusalem mentioned in the *Vita S. Sabae* (§ 104, 1) written by Cyril of Scythopolis. In any case, our Leontius cannot be accused of Origenism, as the monk in question was. Leontius of Byzantium never defended the cause of Origen; he was even a vigorous opponent of the Origenistic eschatology.

2. WORKS ON LEONTIUS OF BYZANTIUM. SEVERUS OF ANTIOCH. JOHANNES MAXENTIUS. — *Fr. Loofs*, Leontius von Byzanz und die gleichnamigen Schriftsteller der griech. Kirche (book i: Texte und Untersuchungen etc., iii. 1—2), Leipzig, 1887. The only complete edition of his work is in *Migne*, PG., lxxxvi. 1 2, Paris, 1865. Concerning this edition cf. *Loofs*, l. c., pp. 8—11. *W Rügamer*, Leontius von Byzanz (Inaug.-Diss.), Würzburg, 1894. *V Ermoni*, De Leontio Byzantino, Paris, 1895. There is a circumstantial account of the religious conference of 531 (not 533) between the Catholics and the Severians in a letter from one of the Catholic representatives, Innocent, bishop of Maronia (east of Philippi in the Aegean), to a friendly priest; unfortunately it has reached us only in a Latin trans-

[1] *Migne*, PG., lxxxvi 2, 2003—2016. [2] Ib., 1915—1945.
[3] Ib., 1901—1916. [4] Ib., 1947—1976.
[5] Adv. Nest. et Eut. I: 1277 D.
[6] Adv. Argum. Sev.: 1944 C.

lation and in a very imperfect shape; it may be seen in *Mansi,* SS. Conc. Coll., viii. 817—834 (lacking in Migne). Cf. *Hefele,* Konziliengeschichte, 2. ed., ii. 747—751; *Loofs,* l. c., pp. 261—268. The compilation of Dionysius Exiguus entitled: Pro controversia de uno e Trinitate in carne passo (§ 114, 3), contains another letter of Innocent: De his qui unum ex Trinitate vel unam subsistentiam seu personam Dominum nostrum Iesum Christum dubitant confiteri; cf. Spicilegium Casinense i. 148—154. The compilation known as Antiquorum patrum doctrina de Verbi incarnatione (*Mai,* Scriptorum vet. nova Coll., Rome, 1833, vii 1, 1—73; lacking in Migne) was composed, according to *Loofs* (l. c., pp. 92 ff.), beetween 662 and 679 and is based on earlier works of the kind. *Loofs* does not agree with the conjecture of *Le Quien* that its author was Anastasius Sinaita (§ 107, 4); cf. *D. Serruys,* Anastasiana I: Antiquorum patrum doctr. de Verbi incarnatione, in Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire (1902), xxii. 157 f. — Severus of Antioch, a celebrated orator and very productive writer, was made Monophysite bishop of that see in 512, but in 518 was compelled to seek refuge at Alexandria; there he sustained against Julian of Halicarnassus (§ 99, 3) that previous to the resurrection the body of Christ partook of the defects and sufferings common to all human bodies. The followers of Severus were called Phthartolatres by their Julianist opponents, i. e. adorers of that which is corruptible. Severus died in Egypt about 539; cf. *J. Eustratios,* Σεβῆρος ὁ μονοφυσίτης πατριάρχης Ἀντιοχείας, Leipzig, 1894. Only fragments of the Greek text of his writings have reached us, partly in anti-Monophysite works and partly in Catenae. Cardinal *Mai* began the editing of these fragments, in Script. vet. nova Coll., Rome, 1837, ix. 725—741: fragments of a Catena on Isaias and Ezechiel; in Classici auctores (1838), x. 408—473: fragments relative to the Gospel of St. Luke and the Acts of the Apostles; in Spicilegium Romanum (1844), x 1, 202 to 205 fragments of a Catena on Job. The Oratio ii de resurrectione Domini published among the works of Gregory of Nyssa (*Migne,* PG., xlvi. 627—652) belongs to Severus and is a remarkable attempt at harmonizing the Gospel-narratives of the apparitions of the Risen Lord (§ 69, 11). Many works of Severus are extant in Syriac versions. The one hundred and twenty-five λόγοι ἐπιθρόνιοι or ἐνθρονιστικοί i. e. homilies delivered in his quality of Antiochene patriarch, were translated from Greek into Syriac about 525 by Paul of Callinicus and again in 701 by Jacob of Edessa; both versions have reached us, at least in part, but hitherto only an insignificant portion of these Syriac translations has been printed; among the printed texts are: a baptismal ritual, Antwerp, 1572 (cf. *A. Resch,* Agrapha [in Texte und Untersuchungen, v. 4], Leipzig, 1889, pp. 361 to 372); some fragments of homilies, in *E. Nestle,* Brevis linguae Syriacae grammatica, Karlsruhe, 1881 (Chrestomathia pp. 79—83), the «fifty-second homily» on the Maccabees is printed in two different translations in *Bensly-Barnes,* The fourth book of Maccabees, Cambridge, 1895, pp. 75 to 102 (cf. the English translation of the first version, given ib., pp. xxvii to xxxiv). Some other fragments of Severus, translated from Syriac into Latin, may be seen in *Mai,* Script. vet. nova Coll. ix. 742—759. four homilies, in Spicil. Rom. x 1, 169—201: extracts from a work against Julian of Halicarnassus, and pp. 212—229: a homily on the Blessed Virgin. On the Syriac versions of the λόγοι ἐπιθρόνιοι see *A. Baumstark,* in Röm. Quartalschr. (1897), xi. 32—46. *A. Kugener,* Allocution prononcée par Sévère après son élévation sur le trône patriarcal d'Antioche, in Oriens christianus (1902), pp. 265—282. For a fragment (in French) of a homily by Severus on St. Barlaam of Antioch see Analecta Bollandiana (1903), xxii. 133—134. The doctrine of Severus is treated of by *Loofs,* l. c., pp. 30—32

54—59. The latter made special use of a work entitled. Ad Timotheum scholasticum de duabus naturis adversus Severum (*Migne,* PG., lxxxvi 1, 901—942), written in the sixth century by a monk Eustathius, otherwise unknown to us. — Valuable letters of Severus have lately been edited (London, 1904) by *E. W Brooks,* The sixth book of the Select Letters of Severus of Antioch in the Syriac version of Athanasius of Nisibis, Text and Translation Society, vol. i, part I (Syriac text), vol. ii, part I (English version). On the life and the works of Severus see various volumes in the series «Patrologia Orientalis» now being edited by *Graffin* and *Nau,* Paris. — The so-called· «Scythian monks» appear at Constantinople in 516. Their leader or mouthpiece is a certain John surnamed Maxentius. They sought to raise a new shibboleth of orthodoxy in the words: «one of the Trinity has suffered in the flesh», while others insisted that there should be neither change nor addition in the text of the creed of Chalcedon (451). Thus arose what is known as the Theopaschite controversy. These monks desired also the condemnation of the writings of the lately deceased Faustus, bishop of Reji (§ 111), asserting that they were favorable to Pelagianism. This demand, likewise, aroused much opposition. The controversies had already entered a graver phase when the legates of Pope Hormisdas arrived at Constantinople, March 25., 519, for the purpose of reconciling the Churches of Rome and Constantinople, a step made possible by the death of the emperor Anastasius I. (July 9., 518), cf. § 99, 4. Maxentius presented to the legates in the name of the «Scythian monks» a petition (Epist. ad legatos sedis apostolicae; *Migne,* PG., lxxxvi. 75—86) that was unsuccessful, whereupon they departed for Rome in the hope of obtaining from Pope Hormisdas a more favorable reply. As the pope delayed his decision, they then had recourse to certain bishops of Africa resident in Sardinia, whither they had been exiled by king Thrasamund. The African bishops, particularly Fulgentius of Ruspe (§ 113, 5), sustained with vigor the cause of the monks (see *S. Fulg.,* Ep. 17 de incarnatione et gratia, written in reply to the work of *Petrus Diaconus,* De incarnatione et gratia. *Migne,* PL., lxii. 83—92. Early in August 520 the monks left Rome for Constantinople. In the same month (Aug. 13., 520), the pope wrote to Possessor, an African bishop resident at Constantinople, condemning in strong terms the conduct of the Scythian monks, and especially the attitude of their representatives at Rome; as to the works of Faustus, the pope declares, they were not among the approved works of the Fathers; the sound doctrine concerning grace and liberty could be learned from the works of St. Augustine (*S. Horm. P.,* Ep. 70). This letter was severely criticised by Maxentius: Ad epistulam Hormisdae responsio; *Migne,* PG., lxxxvi 1, 93—112. It is believed that the priest John to whom St. Fulgentius addressed in 523 his De veritate praedestinationis et gratiae Dei, and the priest or archimandrite John to whom, somewhat later, the Epistola synodica of the African bishops (*Hefele,* Konziliengesch., 2. ed., ii. 697—702) was written, are identical with Johannes Maxentius. Loofs does not accept this identification (l. c., pp. 260 f.), and in case the identification is unfounded, there is no trace of the Scythian monks and their patron Maxentius later than the letter of Hormisdas and the reply of Maxentius. The latter wrote also dialogues against the Nestorians (*Migne,* PG., lxxxvi 1, 115—158) and a treatise against the Acephali (Monophysites), ib., 111—116. All his works have come down to us in Latin, and it is quite certain that they were originally written in Latin. The first and only edition of Maxentius is that of *J. Cochlaeus,* executed from a Nürnberg codex of the writings of St. Fulgentius; this edition was published as an appendix to the edition of

St. Cyprian by *Erasmus* (Basel, 1520) and in the edition of the works of St. Fulgentius by *W. Pirkheimer* and *Cochlaeus* (Hagenau, 1520). The text of Maxentius in *Migne* (l. c., 73—158) is, according to Loofs, «in more ways than one a secondhand and, therefore, variously disfigured reprint« of the *Cochlaeus* edition. At the best, the works of our author are in a very tangled condition. Thus, the Professio de Christo (ib., 79—86), printed as a separate work, is certainly a part of the immediately preceding Epistola ad legatos sedis apostolicae (ib., 75—78). Loofs is the only modern writer who has studied minutely the history of the Scythian monks (l. c., pp. 229—261).

3. THE EMPEROR JUSTINIAN. — Justinian I., who governed the Roman empire so long and famously (527—565), though amid many vicissitudes of fortune, claims a place among the ecclesiastical writers of the sixth century It is true that most of his so-called theological writings[1], when stripped of their doctrinal accessories, appear as administrative acts. As such, though always undertaken with the purest intentions, they represent a perilous interference with the internal life of the Church. Nevertheless, his ecclesiastical policy was in close and sympathetic relation with the literary labors of his above-mentioned contemporary Leontius; hence the Fifth Ecumenical Council (553) could accept the gist of the imperial edicts as corresponding substantially with the faith of the Church. In the guise of a letter to Mennas of Constantinople, Justinian issued (Aug. 6. 536) a constitution *(διάταξις)* against Anthimus, Severus, Petrus and Zoaras[2]; it approves and confirms the anathema pronouncd in 536 by the Synod of Constantinople against these Monophysite bishops. The *Tractatus contra Monophysitas*[3], published in 542 or 543, was addressed to Egyptian monks who had abandoned or were about to abandon that heresy. He published (January 543) an edict against Origen (*λόγος κατὰ Ὠριγένους*[4]; so entitled in the copy sent to the patriarch Mennas). In it he points out the various errors of the Alexandrine theologian: subordinationism, pre-existence of the soul, apocatastasis, multiplicity of worlds, and other errors, he ends with ten «anathematisms» against Origen. Diekamp maintains that the «letter to the Holy Synod» *(γράμμα πρὸς τὴν ἁγίαν σύνοδον)* on Origen and his adherents[5] was written in March or April 553. An edict of the end of 543 or the beginning of 544, unfortunately lost, contained a long exposition of the true faith, and at the end declared anathema against the person and the writings of Theodore of Mopsuestia, the works of Theodoret of Cyrus against Cyril of Alexandria and the Council of Ephesus (§ 78, 7), and the letter of Ibas of Edessa against the same parties (§ 77, 13). This is the first of the so-called edicts against the Three Chapters. As a rule, the anathemas of an edict were called *κεφάλαια* (capitula); in this case,

[1] *Migne*, PG., lxxxvi 1, 945—1152. [2] Ib., 1095—1104.
[3] Ib., 1103—1146. [4] Ib., 945—990. [5] Ib., 989—994.

however, the term Tria capitula, or Three Chapters, served at once to indicate the persons or writings that were the object of the anathemas of the edict. In the Western Church the imperial acts that provoked the controversy of the Three Chapters initiated a series of wretched misunderstandings (the so-called Controversy of Three Chapters). Between 551 and 553, probably in the former year, a second and more severe edict, still extant in its entirety *(ὁμολογία πίστεως κατὰ τῶν τριῶν κεφαλαίων)*[1] was published against the Three Chapters. Similarly, an imperial edict *(τύπος πρὸς τὴν ἁγίαν σύνοδον)*[2], addressed to the Fifth General Council on the day of its opening (May 5. 553), also treats on Theodore, Theodoret and Ibas. In reply to an otherwise unknown protest against the condemnation of the Three Chapters, the emperor wrote a lengthy and acrimonious refutation *(πρός τινας γράψαντας καὶ ἐκδικήσαντας Θεόδωρον κτλ.)*[3], Hefele thinks it was written after the Council, Loofs is of opinion that it was written previous to that event. Justinian also wrote a doctrinal letter to Zoilus, patriarch of Alexandria (542 to about 550); some fragments of it are preserved[4]. A Bulla aurea, addressed to the abbot of Mt. Sinai, closes the list of the imperial theological works and offers no dogmatic interest[5] Evagrius assures us[6] that shortly before the emperors's death he issued a (lost) edict in favor of the Aphthartodocetes, and there is no reason to doubt the accuracy of this statement. At the same time this solitary act of the aged emperor stands out in sharp contrast to what he did in the prime of life.

4. LITERATURE. CONTEMPORARY THEOLOGIANS. — In the Series Latina of the Migne Cursus there are several Latin letters of Justinian; thus, among the letters of Hormisdas (*Migne*, PG., lxiii. 367—534), John II. (Ib., lxvi. 11—32), Agapitus I. (Ib. lxvi. 35—80), and Vigilius (Ib., lxix. 15—178); also most of the above-mentioned documents are extant in Greek and Latin (Ib., lxix. 177—328), finally a selection of (Latin) imperial acts and edicts that seem of importance for ecclesiastical history: novellae ad religionem pertinentes, leges selectae (Ib., lxxii. 921—1110). Most of the writings mentioned no. 3 are also to be found in the collections of the Councils, e. g. *Mansi*, viii—ix. The Tractatus contra Monophysitas was first edited by *Mai*, Script. vet. nova Coll., Rome, 1833, vii 1, 292—313. The Bulla aurea to the abbot of Mt. Sinai was first made known by *C. Tischendorf*, in Anecdota sacra et profana, Leipzig, 1855 1861, pp. 56 to 57. Ancient and reliable witnesses assert that Justinian is the author of the Troparium, an antiphonal ecclesiastical chant, entitled ὁ μονογενὴς υἱὸς καὶ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ, in *W Christ* et *M. Paranikas*, Anthologia graeca carminum christianorum, Leipzig, 1871, p. 52; cf. p. xxxii. For the works of Justinian as described above see *Hefele*, Konziliengeschichte, 2. ed., Freiburg i. Br., 1875, ii. 786—789 798—816 836—844, and passim. *Fr. Diekamp*, Die orientalischen Streitigkeiten im 6. Jahrhundert, Münster,

[1] *Migne*, PG., lxxxvi 1, 993—1036. [2] Ib., 1035—1042.
[3] Ib., 1041—1096. [4] Ib., 1145—1150.
[5] Ib., 1149—1152. [6] Hist. eccl., iv. 39—41.

1899, pp. 37 ff. 82 ff.; *Id.*, Zur Chronologie der origenistischen Streitigkeiten, in Histor. Jahrb. (1900), xxi. 743—757. *A. Knecht,* Die Religionspolitik Kaiser Justinians I. (Inaug.-Diss.), Würzburg, 1896. *G. Pfannmüller,* Die kirchliche Gesetzgebung Justinians, hauptsächlich auf Grund der Novellen, Berlin, 1902. — Agapetus, a deacon of Sancta Sophia at Constantinople and the teacher of Justinian, dedicated to the emperor, apparently in 527 at the beginning of his government, a brief treatise on the duties of a Christian prince: ἔκθεσις κεφαλαίων παραινετικῶν; *Migne,* PG., lxxxvi 1, 1163—1186. This little manual for princes was highly appreciated at a later date, imitated, and translated into several modern vernaculars; cf. *Fabricius-Harles,* Bibl. gr. viii. 36—42 (= *Migne,* l. c., 1155—1162); *Hoffmann,* Bibliographisches Lexikon, 2. ed., i. 101—104. — The writings of Heraclian, bishop of Chalcedon early in the sixth century, have perished. He is remembered for a work against Soterichus, bishop of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, who was inclined to Eutychianism; for manuscript fragments (cf. *Le Quien,* Oriens christianus, i. 602 f.); he also wrote another work in twenty books against the Manichæans, much praised by Photius (Bibl. Cod. 85 231; *C. Manich.,* i. 11). — Ephræm of Antioch (527—545) was one of the most strenuous contemporary defenders of the faith of the Church against Nestorians and Eutychians. Photius was acquainted with three of his works; the first contained discourses of a doctrinal character and panegyrics (Bibl. Cod. 228), the second contained four books of an exclusively doctrinal character and was devoted principally to the defence of the faith of Chalcedon (Cod. 229); of the third work Photius says nothing specific. A few small fragments of Ephræm were found by Cardinal Mai in a work entitled: ex apologia pro synodo Chalcedonensi et epistola S. Leonis, e tertio libro contra Severum. etc. (*Migne,* PG., lxxxvi 2, 2103—2110). — In the first half of the sixth century a monk named Job wrote a work against Severus, and another entitled οἰκονομικὴ πραγματεία, on the Redemption of mankind by Christ (*Phot.,* Bibl. Cod. 222); the latter work is described very minutely by Photius (l. c.). A single fragment of this second work has reached us (*Migne,* l. c., lxxxvi. 3313 to 3320); the fragment which follows it in Migne (3320 ff.) belongs to another Job, an Apollinarist bishop (§ 61, 4). — In 540, John, bishop of Scythopolis, appeared as a defender of the Catholic faith against the Monophysites and as an opponent of Severus in particular. Concerning him and his lost works cf. *Loofs,* Leontius von Byzanz (1887), i. 269—272. — A little treatise against the Origenistic doctrines of pre-existence and apocatastasis, entitled «The teaching of St. Barsanuphius concerning the opinions of Origen, Evagrius, and Didymus» (*Migne,* PG., lxxxvi 1, 891 to 902), was probably composed among the Palestinian monks about the middle of the sixth century. — A sharp denunciation of the errors of Origen was composed about 553 by Theodore, bishop of Scythopolis (Ib., lxxxvi 1, 231—236), and addressed to Justinian and the patriarchs of Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem. For Theodore see *Diekamp,* Die origenist. Streitigkeiten, pp. 125—129. — There is current under the name of St. Gregentius, said to have been bishop of Taphar in the land of the Homerites (Himjarites in Southern Arabia) during the reign of Justinian, a collection of the laws of that people: νόμοι τῶν Ὁμηριτῶν (Ib., lxxvi 1, 567—620) and a controversy with a Jew named Herban: διάλεξις μετὰ Ἰουδαίου Ἑρμᾶν τοὔνομα (Ib., lxxvi 1, 621—784). These two works follow one another, and are in a certain sense but one work; it is usually stated that they are forgeries, though no specific investigation has made the fact evident. The political and religious conditions of Southern Arabia are described by *H. Fell,* in Zeitschr. der Deutschen morgenländ. Gesell-

schaft (1881), xxxv. 1—74. The principal source of our knowledge concerning these events is a Syriac letter of Simeon, bishop of Betharsam (510—525), concerning the martyrs of the land of the Homerites (cf. *Fell*, l. c., pp. 2 ff.); it was edited and translated into Italian by *J. Guidi*, Rome, 1881, in Reale Accademia dei Lincei, anno 278. *J. Deramey*, Les martyrs de Nedjran au pays des Homérites, en Arabie (522—525), Paris, 1893. — Another contemporary of Justinian was the monk Alexander of Salamina, known as the author of a panegyric (ἐγκώμιον) on St. Barnabas (*Migne*, PG., lxxxvii 3, 4087—4106, only in a Latin version, though the Greek text was available in Acta SS. Junii, ii. 436—453). For a detailed account of this discourse see *Lipsius*, Die apokryphen Apostelgeschichten, Brunswick, 1884, ii 2, 298– 304. In another discourse Alexander took for his theme the finding of the Holy Cross: λόγος εἰς τὴν εὕρεσιν τοῦ τιμίου καὶ ζωοποιοῦ σταυροῦ (Ib., lxxxvii 3, 4015—4076, and summarized, Ib., lxxxvii 3, 4077—4088).

### § 103. Historians and Geographers.

1. THEODORUS LECTOR. — This writer held the office of anagnostes or reader (lector) in the church of Sancta Sophia at Constantinople, in the first half of the sixth century. We possess from his pen two works of an ecclesiastico-historical character. The first is an epitome in two books of the ecclesiastico-historical works of Socrates, Sozomen and Theodoret, with an independent continuation reaching to Justin I. (518—527), also in two books. The second work is known to us only through a few excerpts that have been united with others of the same nature, and in the manuscripts are entitled: *ἀπὸ φωνῆς Νικηφόρου Καλλίστου*, but are in reality much older than the church-historian Nicephorus Callistus in the beginning of the fourteenth century. The first work is extant in manuscripts but has not yet been edited.

*Valerius* thought it useless to publish the compendium of Theodorus in his edition of the Greek Church-historians (Paris, 1673; § 62, 7); he merely inserted variant readings therefrom in his notes to Socrates' text; the excerpts from the other work were printed by him after the fragments of Philostorgius (*Migne*, PG., lxxxvi 1, 165—228, from *Valesius-Reading*, Cambridge, 1730). For the manuscripts and the antiquity of the excerpts see *C. de Boor*, in Zeitschr. f. Kirchengesch. (1883—1884), vi. 489—491; *Id.*, Zu Theodorus Lektor (ib., ii. 23): *Migne*, l. c., lxxxvi 1, 573—577. We owe some new excerpts to quotations made by Nicetas, Chartophylax of Nicæa; cf. *Fr. Diekamp*, in Hist. Jahrb. (1903), xxiv. 553—558. *Nolte*, Zu Theodorus Lector und Eustathios von Epiphania nebst einem noch ungedruckten Bruchstücke des letzteren, in Theol. Quartalschr. (1861), xliii. 569—582. Eustathius of Epiphania in Syria was the author of a (lost) chronicle, that was one of the sources of Theodorus Lector, and reached from the earliest times to 502. *J. V. Sarrazin*, De Theodoro Lectore Theophanis fonte praecipuo, in Commentationes philologae Jenenses, Leipzig, 1881, i. 163—238. For the chronicler Theophanes Confessor († ca. 817) cf. *Krumbacher*, Gesch. der byzant. Lit., 2. ed., pp. 342 ff.

2. ZACHARIAS RHETOR. — Zacharias was originally a lawyer (*σχολαστικός*, rhetor) of Berytus in Phoenicia. At a later date, cer-

tainly after 536, he was bishop of Mitylene in Lesbos (not Melitene in Armenia Minor). His death must have taken place before 553. While still a lawyer, shortly after 491, he composed a work on ecclesiastical history that covered the period from 450 to 491, but treated chiefly of matters personal to the author at Alexandria and in Palestine. The original Greek text has perished, but the work survives in the twelve books of an anonymous general history in Syriac that begins at the creation of the world and reaches the years 568—569. The books iii—vi of this work are a Syriac recension of the history of Zacharias. Zacharias wrote also at Constantinople about 551, a life of Severus (§ 102, 2), the Monophysite patriarch of Antioch, and a life of the hermit Isaias (§ 64, 5), both of which are extant only in Syriac versions. In these writings there is certain and frequent evidence that the author was a Monophysite. On the other hand, at the Synod of Constantinople in 536, he voted as bishop of Mitylene for the deposition of Anthimus, Monophysite patriarch of Constantinople[1] He was probably a young man when he composed the dialogue «Ammonius» still extant in Greek, and so called from the Neoplatonist Ammonius Hermiae, who resided in Alexandria about 500, and whose teaching concerning the eternity of matter is opposed by Zacharias in this dialogue.

The Syriac universal history was edited by *J. P. N. Land,* Anecdota Syriaca iii, Leyden, 1870. This edition could be improved. Some chapters of several books of this compilation had already been edited (in Syriac and Latin) by *Mai* (Script. vet. nova Coll., Rome, 1838, x 1, 332 to 388; cf. xii—xiv; the Latin version is reprinted in *Migne,* PG., lxxxv 1145—1178). The greater part of the entire compilation was edited and translated into German by *K. Ahrens* and *G. Krüger,* Die sog. Kirchengeschichte des Zacharias Rhetor, Leipzig, 1899 (Scriptores sacri et profani iii). Similarly, the greater part of the compilation appeared in an English translation by *F. J. Hamilton* and *E. W. Brooks,* London, 1899. Both versions, especially the German, are criticized by *M. A. Kugener* in Revue de l'Orient chrét. (1900), v. 201—214 461—480. The life of Isaias is also in Syriac, in *Land,* l. c., pp. 346—356, and in German in the work of *Ahrens* and *Krüger,* l. c., pp. 263—274. Cf. *M. A. Kugener* Observations sur la vie de l'ascète Isaias et sur les vies de Pierre l'Ibérien et de Théodore d'Antinoë par Zacharie le scholastique, in Byzant. Zeitschrift (1900), ix. 464—470. For the life and works of Severus see § 102, 2. *Migne* (l. c., lxxxv. 1011—1044) reproduces the dialogue «Ammonius» (Disputatio de mundi opificio) from the edition of *C. Barth,* Leipzig, 1654. *J. Fr. Boissonade* edited it anew, Paris, 1836. The fragment of the work against the Manichæans is printed in Latin by *Migne,* l. c., lxxxv. 1143 to 1144, and in Greek by *Pitra,* Analecta sacra et classica, Paris, 1888 i. 67—70. — The Church-history of the Nestorian priest of Antioch Basilius Cilix (of Cilicia) has perished, like all the other writings of the same author. Photius says (Bibl. Cod. 42) that it began with the emperor Marcian and came down to the death of Justin I. (527). Cf. *Fabricius-Harles,* Bibl. gr. vii. 419 to420; x. 692 710.

[1] *Mansi,* SS. Conc. Coll., viii. 926 933 975 976.

3. EVAGRIUS SCHOLASTICUS. — The writings of Evagrius are much more important than those of Theodorus and Zacharias. He was born at Epiphania in Syria, in 536 or 537, and lived as a lawyer, *σχολαστικός*, at a later period in Antioch. When Gregory, patriarch of Antioch, was called to Constantinople in 588 to account for his conduct, Evagrius accompanied his bishop and defended him before the emperor and the synod, with the address of a skilful lawyer and the zeal of a faithful friend. He was made quaestor by the emperor Tiberius II. (578—582), and honorary prefect (*ἀπὸ ἐπάρχων*, ex praefectis) by the emperor Mauricius. He died at Antioch towards the end of the sixth century. His Church-history, though comprehensive, touches too often and too extensively on political history. In the preface the author describes it as a continuation of the histories of Socrates, Sozomen and Theodoret. Its six books cover the period from 431 to 594. The narrative is based on the most reliable authorities, and gives evidence of whole-souled devotion to the truth and of sincerely orthodox faith. Here and there he exhibits an excessive credulity and a fondness for the miraculous. The diction of Evagrius has been declared by Photius[1] to be graceful, though somewhat prolix. It is to him that we owe, in large measure, our knowledge of the development of Nestorianism and Monophysitism. He wrote another work that seems to have perished. According to himself[2] it contained «reports, letters, edicts, discourses, dialogues, and other things». The «reports» *(ἀναφοραί)* were drawn up by him mostly by order and in the name of the patriarch Gregory. Among the «discourses» *(λόγοι)* was doubtless the congratulatory address to emperor Mauricius on the birth of his son Theodosius. Evagrius seems to have projected a monograph on the Persian campaigns of Mauricius[3], but he never executed the work.

The editio princeps of Evagrius is owing to *H. Valesius*, Paris, 1673 (§ 86, 7). It is reprinted in *Migne*, PG., lxxxvi 2, 2415—2886, from *Valesius-Reading*, Cambridge, 1720. There is a new and excellent edition by *J. Bidez* and *L. Parmentier*, London, 1899 (Byzantine texts, ed. by *J. B. Bury*). In his Gesch. der byzant. Lit., 2. ed., pp. 246 f., *Krumbacher* quotes the latest and best works concerning the ecclesiastical history of Evagrius. — There are extant four sermons of the above-mentioned patriarch Gregory of Antioch (570—593; cf. § 107, 1). They may be found in *Migne*, PG., lxxxviii. 1847—1866. The second is known to us only in a Latin version. Cf. *S. Haidacher*, Zu den Homilien des Gregorius von Antiochia und des Gregorius Thaumaturgus, in Zeitschr. f. kath. Theol. (1901), xxv. 367—369.

4. CHRONICLERS. — The universal history of Hesychius of Miletus, written about the middle of the sixth century; the popular universal chronicle of John Malalas of Antioch, written in the second half of the same century, and the chronicle of John of Antioch, written

[1] Bibl. Cod. 29. [2] Hist. eccl., vi. 24. [3] Ib., v. 20.

at the beginning of the seventh century, do not come within the scope of this work. To the first half of the seventh century belongs a diffuse chronological compilation, that began with the creation, and is usually known as the Paschal Chronicle, *Chronicon Paschale,* because it bases Christian chronology on the paschal cycle. The unknown author was probably an ecclesiastic of Constantinople in the service or entourage of the patriarch Sergius (610—638). His chronological framework of ancient history is mostly constructed from Julius Africanus and Eusebius, and is adorned with a number of miscellaneous historical notices and statements that become reliable in proportion as the author approches his own time, i. e. the first decade of the seventh century About the year 700, John, Monophysite bishop of Nikiu, an island in the main Western branch of the Nile, wrote a universal chronicle. Though written from a Monophysite standpoint, it contains copious materials for ecclesiastical history; for the history of the seventh century, at least, it is an authority at once independent and excellent. It has reached us in an ethiopic (Amhara) translation, made in 1601 in Abyssinia from a very imperfect copy of an Arabic translation. Zotenberg, who edited and translated the Ethiopic text, is of opinion that the work was originally composed in Greek, though some sections of it were written in Coptic; Nöldeke thinks it more probable that the entire work was written in Coptic.

On Hesychius of Miletus, John Malalas (*Migne,* PG., xcvii) and John of Antioch cf. *Krumbacher,* Gesch. der byzant. Lit., 2. ed., pp. 323 ff. — The editio princeps of the Chronicon Paschale was prepared by *L. Dindorf,* Bonn, 1832, 2 vols. (Corpus scriptorum hist. Byzant.). It is reprinted in *Migne,* PG., xcii. Cf. *H. Gelzer,* Sextus Julius Africanus, Leipzig, 1885, ii 1, 138—176, and *Krumbacher,* l. c., p. 339; also *F. C. Conybeare,* in Journal of Theological Studies (1901—1902), ii. 288—298, and in Byzant. Zeitschr. (1902), xi. 395—405. *G. Mercati,* A Study of the Paschal Chronicle, in Journal of Theol. Studies (1906), vii. 397—412. — La Chronique de Jean, évêque de Nikiou. Notice et extraits par *M. H. Zotenberg,* Paris, 1879 (Journal asiatique 1877, n. 15). Cf. *Th. Nöldeke,* in Gött. Gel. Anzeigen (1881), pp. 587—594. Chronique de Jean, évêque de Nikiou. Texte éthiopien publié et traduit par *H. Zotenberg,* Paris, 1883 (Notices des Manuscrits xxiv. 1). Cf. *Nöldeke,* in Gött. Gel. Anzeigen (1883), pp. 1364 to 1374.

5. COSMAS INDICOPLEUSTES. — Cosmas, surnamed «the Indian traveller» *(ὁ Ἰνδικοπλεύστης)*, was an Alexandrine merchant who undertook about the year 520 long commercial voyages, particularly through Arabia and Eastern Africa. On his return to Egypt he became a monk and devoted a great deal of his time to various literary labors, only one of which has reached us: his Christian Topography *(χριστιανικὴ τοπογραφία)*[1], composed about 547, in twelve books, the last of which

[1] *Migne,* PG., lxxxviii. 51—470.

exists only in fragments. There are also extant, under the name of Cosmas, some fragments on the Psalms. Three other large works, to which he occasionally refers in the Topography, have perished: a Cosmography «in which the whole world was described, both on this side of the ocean and on the other» [1], astronomical tables [2], and an «interpretation of the Canticle of canticles [3]. The Christian Topography merits attention for several reasons, in spite of the many singular and fantastic ideas of its author. In seeming harmony with scriptural phraseology, he imagines the world to be a great rectangular space surrounded on all sides by walls that gradually approach one another, and by their meeting form the celestial vault. In the first book he vigorously opposes the theory of the rotundity of the earth; in the second book he develops his own theories, while in the third and fourth books he alleges scriptural proofs in favor of the same. The fifth book is important for the history of Biblical Introduction: it contains information on the authors, scope, and contents of the biblical books. In exegesis, hermeneutics and biblical theology Cosmas follows the guidance of Theodore of Mopsuestia. His account [4] of the «great island in the Indian Ocean called Sielediva by the Indians, and by the Greeks Taprobane» i. e. the island of Ceylon, possessed great attraction for mediæval readers.

The first edition of the Christian Topography was made from a seventh-century Vatican manuscript by *B. de Montfaucon,* Collectio nova Patr. et Script. graec., Paris, 1706, ii. 113 ff. The pictures with which Cosmas illustrated his work were reproduced (with a commentary) from the same manuscript by P. *R. Garrucci,* Storia della arte cristiana (Prato, 1876), iii. 70—83, tables 142—153. The great importance of this manuscript for the history of Byzantine art is brought out by *N. Kondakoff,* Histoire de l'art byzantin, Paris, 1886—1891, i. 136—151. Cf. *J. Strzygowski,* Der Bilderkreis des griechischen Physiologus, des Kosmas Indicopleustes und Oktateuch nach Handschriften der Bibliothek zu Smyrna (Byzant. Archiv, fasc. ii), Leipzig, 1899. The account given by Cosmas of the monument of Aduli (now Zulla, somewhat south of Massaua in Abyssinia) and its historically very important inscriptions was edited anew by *de Lagarde,* in Nachrichten von der k. Gesellschaft der Wissensch. zu Göttingen (1890), pp. 418—448; see also the dissertation of *de Lagarde,* in the Abhandlungen of the same society (1891), xxxvii, «Register und Nachträge», pp. 69—75. An English version of the Christian Topography was published by *J. W. McCrindle,* London, 1897. On Cosmas in general and his works see *H. Gelzer,* Kosmas der Indienfahrer, in Jahrb. für protest. Theol. (1883), ix. 105—141. *E. O. Winstedt,* Notes from Cosmas Indicopleustes, in Journal of Theol. Studies (1905), vi. 282—285. *E. Mangenot,* in Dict. de Théologie, Paris, 1908, iii. 1916—1917. Other literature concerning the cosmological ideas of Cosmas may be found in *Krumbacher,* l. c., p. 414. For the fragments on the Psalms see *Fabricius-Harles,* Bibl. gr., iv. 261—262 (= *Migne,* PG., lxxxviii. 27—28).

[1] Lib. 1, col. 53 A. [2] 1, 53 B; cf. 7, 340 B. [3] 8, 388 B.
[4] 11, 445 ff.

6. NOTITIAE EPISCOPATUUM. — Under this heading come certain statistics of the Greek Church, known specifically as *ταχτικά*. They are catalogues of the patriarchal sees and of the metropolitan sees subject to them, together with the autocephalous archiepiscopal sees, likewise the metropolitan sees and of the episcopal churches subject to the metropolitans. These lists of episcopal sees were originally drawn up for administrative purposes, and as they were variously modified in the course of time, it has become difficult to fix the original date of their compilation. Some of these «notitiae» certainly belong to the patristic age.

In the work of *G. Parthey,* Hieroclis Synecdemus et Notitiae graecae episcopatuum, Berlin, 1866, pp. 53—261, the reader will find a statistical description of the Eastern Empire previous to 535; it contains thirteen episcopal catalogues as described above. The Synecdemus of the grammarian Hierocles was edited again, from new manuscripts, by *A. Burckhardt,* Leipzig, 1893. As to the date of the Notitiae cf. *H. Gelzer,* in Jahrb. f. protest. Theol. (1886), xii. 337—372 529—575. The results of his investigations were verified and completed by *C. de Boor,* in Zeitschr. f. Kirchengesch. (1890—1891), xii. 303—322 519—534; (1893—1894), xiv. 573—599. In vol. xii (pp. 519—534) *de Boor* made known a hitherto undiscovered Notitia of the beginning of the eighth century. In the meantime *Gelzer* had republished the Notitia I[a] of *Parthey* (pp. 55—94), and demonstrated that only its first part was of ecclesiastical origin, while the second part (530—1064, Parthey) is a description of the Roman Empire composed early in the seventh century by an otherwise unknown George of Lapathus in Cyprus: Georgii Cyprii Descriptio orbis Romani, ed. *H. Gelzer,* Leipzig, 1890. For further information concerning manuscripts of the Notitiae episcopatuum see *Gelzer,* Analecta Byzantina, in Index scholarum Jenens. per sem. hib. 1891—1892; cf. *Id.,* Ungedruckte und wenig bekannte Bistümerverzeichnisse der orientalischen Kirche, in Byzant. Zeitschr. (1893), ii. 22—72; *Id.,* Ungedruckte und ungenügend veröffentlichte Texte der Notitiae Episcopatuum. Ein Beitrag zur byzantinischen Kirchen- und Verwaltungsgeschichte, Munich, 1901, in Abhandl. der kgl. bayer. Akad. der Wissensch. For the use made by Epiphanius of these historical sources cf. *Fr. N. Finck,* Des Epiphanios von Cypern ἔκθεσις πρωτοκλησιῶν πατριαρχῶν τε καὶ μετροπολιτῶν, armenisch und griechisch herausgegeben von *Fr. N. Finck,* Marburg, 1902.

### § 104. Hagiographers.

1. CYRIL OF SCYTHOPOLIS. — Cyril was born at Scythopolis, the ancient Bethsan[1] in Galilee, and was still a child when in the winter of 531—532 he became acquainted with Sabas, the famous hermit-abbot. This event was destined to affect his future; at the age of twenty he bade adieu (543) to his native town and began to live the pious life of the desert. The following year (544) he entered the monastery of St. Euthymius, by the advice of St. John the Hermit (Hesychastes, Silentiarius). In 555 he appears among the

[1] Ios. xvii. 11.

one hundred and twenty orthodox monks who occupied the New Laura near Jerusalem, after the violent expulsion of the Origenistic monks by Anastasius, dux Palaestinae. In 557 he built for himself a cell in the great Laura of St. Sabas, also in the neighborhood of Jerusalem. It was probably there that, soon afterwards, he passed away Cyril was always deeply interested in the lives and deeds of the great models of the ascetic life, and, from the time of his entrance into the monastery of St. Euthymius, had been a diligent and critical gatherer of bibliographical information, especially concerning St. Euthymius († 473) one of the chief organizers of monasticism in Palestine, and St. Sabas († 532). Before his entrance into the great Laura, he had been encouraged by his friend George, abbot of Beella near Scythopolis, to compose lives of the afore-said hermit-monks. The work soon assumed a broader character. In the life of St. Sabas (c. 21) he refers to a life of St. John the Hermit († 558) that he means to write, he begins this third and shorter biography with the words: «The first place in my narrative I assign to the abbot John»: *πρῶτον προτίθημι τῷ λόγῳ τὸν ἀββᾶν Ἰωάννην*, whence it is evident that he intended to execute a series of these shorter biographies. Cyril must have met with some obstacle to the fulfilment of his purpose, for (apparently) only three other biographies are extant under his name. Moreover, they have reached us separately, and not in a collection headed by the life of St. John the Hermit; they are entitled: a life of the abbot Cyriacus († 556); a life of St. Theodosius, founder of a monastery of the same name († 529), a life of St. Theognius († 522). Theognius had lived forty years among the monks of Palestine when he was made bishop of Betelia, near Gaza (494). Cyril devotes but a few pages to Theodosius and Theognius. There existed already a long panegyric of Theodosius, delivered by the monk Theodorus, probably about 530 in the Saint's own monastery, but completed and published about 547; Theodorus eventually became bishop of Peträ. A funeral discourse on St. Theognius was also published about 526 by Paul, abbot of Elusa in Idumaea. Hence, Cyril was content to furnish a concise sketch of Theodosius and Theognius, exercising at the same time a covert but modest critique of his predecessor's narratives. Theodore and Paul are panegyrists; Cyril is an historian. Though he is not free from the contemporary predilection for the miraculous, he writes as one sincerely desirous of arriving at the truth; he spares no labor in the pursuit of reliable knowledge, and strives earnestly to correct and complete the information he has collected; he is, in a particular way, minutely solicitous concerning the accuracy of his chronological data. His works are an authority of the highest order on the history of the Holy Land and the Church of Jerusalem in the fifth and sixth centuries.

The Vita S. Euthymii was edited by *B. de Montfaucon*, in the Benedictine Analecta Graeca, Paris, 1688, i. 1—99; the Vita S. Sabae by *J. B. Cotelerius*, Ecclesiae Graecae monumenta, Paris, 1686, iii. 220—376, and *N. Pomjalovskij*, St. Petersburg, 1900 (Russian), who added an Old-Slavonic version. On the Vita S. Sabae cf. *Fr. Diekamp*, Die origenist. Streitigkeiten im 6. Jahrhundert, Münster, 1899, pp. 5 ff. The Vita S. Ioannis Silentiarii was published by the *Bollandists*, Acta SS. Maii (iii), 16*—21*; in Latin, pp. 232—238. The Vita S. Cyriaci is in Acta SS. Sept. (viii), 147—159. In Echos d'Orient (1901), iv. 282 f., *S. Pétrides* attributes to this Cyriacus a hymn on Lazarus, the complete text of which has been edited by *K. Krumbacher*, Romanos und Kyriakos, Munich, 1901, a reprint from the Sitzungsberichte of the Munich Academy. The two Vitae S. Theodosii, by Theodorus and by Cyril, were published by *H. Usener*, in two university-dissertations (Bonn, 1890), and again in. Der hl. Theodosios, Leipzig, 1890. Cf. *Krumbacher*, Studien zu den Legenden des hl. Theodosios, in Sitzungsberichte der philos.-philol. und histor. Klasse der kgl. bayer. Akad. der Wissensch. (1892), pp. 220—379. Krumbacher has shown, with the aid of considerable manuscript evidence, that the edition of *Usener* lacks a suitable foundation, being based on a single manuscript, and that of the eleventh century. The two Vitae S. Theognii, by Paul and by Cyril, were edited in the Analecta Bollandiana (1891), x. 73—118, and contemporaneously by *A. Papadopulos-Kerameus*, Petersburg, 1891 (Russian). Cf. *J. van den Gheyn*, St. Théognius, in Revue des questions historiques (1891), l. 559—576. In Ἀνάλεκτα ἱεροσολυμιτικῆς σταχυολογίας (1897), iv. 175—184, *Papadopulos-Kerameus* published a Vita S. Gerasimi, that is probably also the work of Cyril of Scythopolis. Cf. *S. Vailhé*, Dict. de Théologie, Paris, 1908, iii. 2581—2582.

2. JOHANNES MOSCHUS AND SOPHRONIUS. — Narratives like those of Cyril of Scythopolis became so popular, particularly among the monks, that there grew up a species of ecclesiastical literature that may be described as «Monastic Memorials». The best-known specimens of such writings are the *Historia Lausiaca* of Palladius (§ 79, 4) and the *Pratum spirituale* of Johannes Moschus. The latter was a writer of the end of the sixth century Wearied of the world, as we read in an ancient anonymous account, John retired to the monastery of St. Theodosius at Jerusalem, whence he went at a later date to the monks who dwelt beside the Jordan and in the New Laura. He also travelled through Syria, Egypt and Italy. Shortly before his death, which took place at Rome in 619, he composed a long account of the extraordinary virtues and miracles of contemporary ascetics. His information was drawn partly from his personal experience, and partly from oral and written communications of contemporaries. He dedicated the work to his disciple and companion Sophronius, and called it «The Meadow» (λειμών, Pratum spirituale), because, as the manuscripts add and the dedication attests, «it offers a flowery narrative of the life of the heavenly rose garden». In the course of time, as often happens to much used books of devotion, the text underwent many alterations, was either compressed into «compendia», or considerably amplified. Photius says[1] that in some of

[1] Bibl. Cod. 199.

the manuscript copies he had read, there were 304 chapters, while other copies contained 342 chapters or narratives; the printed editions exhibit 219 chapters. In collaboration with Sophronius, Moschus wrote a life of John the Almoner (ἐλεήμων, eleemosynarius), patriarch of Alexandria (610—619), with whom both writers had long kept up friendly intercourse. A fragment of this biography is still extant in the first chapter of the *Vita S. Ioannis Eleemosynarii,* current under the name of Simeon Metaphrastes. — The above-mentioned Sophronius was for several decades a monk of the monastery of St. Theodosius and as such was distinguished for knowledge, piety and zeal. In 634 he was made patriarch of Jerusalem and occupied the see for four stormy and troublous years († 638). He owes his literary reputation chiefly to his homilies and hymns (§ 105, 3). He also composed some biographies, a full account of the lives of Saints Cyrus and John, and a life of St. Mary of Egypt. Cyrus and John had suffered martyrdom under Diocletian at Alexandria and were held in high honor throughout Egypt. In the first part of his work Sophronius relates the lives and sufferings of both Saints, their burial and the subsequent translation of their relics; in the second part he describes seventy miracles performed through their intercession, the last of these θαύματα being his own delivery from the danger of loss of sight. St. Mary of Egypt is thought by some to have lived in the fourth century, but by others in the fifth or the sixth; she had led a sinful life at Alexandria, but was struck by a ray of divine grace in the city of Jerusalem, and thenceforth, for forty-eight years, led a life of penance in the desert east of the Jordan.

The above-mentioned Vita S. Joannis Moschi precedes in several manuscripts and editions the «Pratum spirituale»; thus in Magna Bibl. vet. Patr., Paris, 1644, xiii. 1053—1055. There is a Latin version in *Migne,* PL., lxxiv. 119—122. An Italian translation was printed at Venice as early as 1475, and again at Vicenza, in 1479; the translation was made from the Latin version of Ambrogio Camaldolese († 1439). This Latin version was reprinted at Venice 1558, and often since, also in *Migne,* PL., lxxiv. 121 to 240. The Greek text was edited in 1624 by *Fronto Ducaeus,* completed and corrected in 1681 by *J. B. Cotelier,* reprinted in *Migne,* PG., lxxxvii 3, 2851—3112. For the life of St. John the Almoner by Moschus and Sophronius see *H. Gelzer,* in his edition of the Vita S. Joannis Eleemosynarii by Leontius of Naples (see no. 3), Freiburg and Leipzig, 1893, pp. xv—xvi; the same Vita, under the name of Simeon Metaphrastes, is in *Migne,* PG., cxiv. 895—966. *S. Vailhé,* St. Jean Mosch, in Echos d'Orient (1901), v. 107—116 356—387. — The most complete edition of the works current under the name of Sophronius is that of Cardinal *Mai;* most of them were first edited by him; they are also in *Migne,* PG., lxxxvii 3, 3147—4014. The lives of Cyrus and John (*Migne,* l. c., 3379—3676) are followed by two other short Vitae of the martyrs (Ib. lxxxvii. 3677 to 3696); the latter are wrongly attributed to Sophronius. The Vita S. Mariae Aegyptiae (Ib. lxxxvii. 3697—3726) is also in Latin in *Migne,* PL., lxxiii. 671—690. *F. Delmas,* Remarques sur la vie de Sainte Marie l'Egyptienne, in Echos d'Orient (1900), iv. 35—42; (1901), vi. 15—17. An Ethiopic

version of the life was published by *F. M. Esteras Pereira,* Lisbon, 1903. For the other writings of Sophronius cf. § 105, 3; *L. de Saint-Aignan,* Vie de St. Sophrone, patriarche de Jérusalem, in Acad. de Sainte-Croix d'Orléans, Lectures et Mémoires (1886), v. 229—244; *Gelzer,* in the above-mentioned edition of the Vita S. Joannis Eleemos. by Leontius (1893), pp. 118 f. *S. Vailhé,* Sophrone le sophiste et Sophrone le patriarche, in Revue de l'Orient chrétien (1902), vii. 360—385; (1903), viii. 32—69.

3. LEONTIUS OF NAPLES AND LEONTIUS OF ROME. — We are not informed as to the life of Leontius, bishop of Neapolis (Nemosia) in Cyprus, during the first half of the seventh century. Several of his writings, however, have reached us: a biography of St. John the Almoner, or chapters supplementary to the biography described above (no. 2); a life of the monk Simeon who became a fool *(τοῦ σαλοῦ)*, «for the love of Christ», some homilies and fragments of a large controversial work against the Jews. His life of St. Spiridion of Trimithus, the patron of Cyprus, appears to have perished. These biographies, the author expressly says, were written for the edification of the people. The life of St. John is founded on evidence of the best kind, the testimony of contemporary persons and eye-witnesses. Many items in the life of St. Simeon serve to illustrate the history of contemporary manners and institutions. — «Leontius, priest and monk and prior of the monastery of St. Saba at Rome», is as he himself tells us the name of the author of a Greek life of St. Gregory of Girgenti (on the south coast of Sicily). In the introduction to this life the author makes known that he was a younger contemporary of St. Gregory. The latter wrote a copious commentary on Ecclesiastes in Greek, which is still extant; he must have been bishop of Girgenti at the end of the sixth or at the beginning of the seventh century.

The works of Leontius of Naples are in *Migne,* PG., xciii. 1565 ff. In his Sammlung ausgew kirchen- und dogmengeschichtl. Quellenschriften (5), Freiburg i. Br., 1893, *H. Gelzer* edited the Greek text of the Vita S. Joannis Eleemos. It is in *Migne,* l. c., 1613—1668, and also in the Latin version of Anastasius Bibliothecarius († about 879) in *Migne,* PL., lxxiii. 337 to 392. On Leontius and his writings in general see *Gelzer,* Ein griechischer Volksschriftsteller des 7. Jahrh., in Histor. Zeitschr., new series (1889), xxv. 1—38. — The commentary of Gregory on Ecclesiastes was edited by *St. A. Morcelli,* Venice, 1791 (*Migne,* PG., xcviii. 741—1182). Morcelli added, as an introduction, the Greek text of the life of Gregory (Ib., xcviii. 549—716). On Gregory see *Smith* and *Wace,* A Dictionary of Christ. Biography, ii. 776—777, and on Leontius of Rome, ib., iii. 692. — Eustratius, a priest of Constantinople, narrated in a funeral oration (*Migne,* PG., lxxxvi 2, 2273—2390) the life of his master and friend Eutychius, patriarch of Constantinople (552—582). The latter left an incomplete Sermo de paschate et de sacrosancta eucharistia (Ib., lxxxvi. 2391 to 2402), and a letter to Pope Vigilius (Ib., lxxxvi. 2401—2406). Eustratius wrote also a polemical work against the theory of the «sleep of the soul»: λόγος ἀνατρεπτικὸς πρὸς τοὺς λέγοντας μὴ ἐνεργεῖν τὰς τῶν ἀνθρώπων ψυχὰς μετὰ τὴν διάζευξιν τῶν ἑαυτῶν σωμάτων κτλ.; most of it was edited by

*Leo Allatius,* De utriusque ecclesiae, occidentalis atque orientalis, perpetua in dogmate de purgatorio consensione, Rome, 1655, pp. 319—580 (lacking in Migne). — George II., patriarch of Alexandria (621—631), left a Vita S. Joannis Chrysostomi (*Migne,* PG., cxiv. 1045—1210), that is of little value. — Nicephorus, a rhetorician of Antioch, said to have lived in the seventh century, wrote a long panegyric of the younger St. Simeon Stylites († 596). It is found in *Migne,* PG., lxxxvi 2, 2987—3216. A letter and a fragment of another letter, written by this Saint, are preserved in the acts of the Seventh Ecumenical Council (787): *Migne,* l. c., 3215 to 3220). Cf. *S. Pétrides,* in Echos d'Orient (1902), vi. 270—274.

### § 105. Poets.

1. ST. ROMANOS THE SINGER. — In the Greek Church, after the fifth century, metrical or quantitative versification steadily gave way to a rhythmic poetry that laid all stress on accent, and paid no attention to the length of syllables. It soon came about that the ancient metrical laws were known and observed only by men of scholarly tastes. The rhythmic form was much favored on account of the growing splendor of the Greek liturgy and it rapidly attained an incomparable perfection. The chief representative of the new school, «the Pindar of rhythmic poetry», is St. Romanos, surnamed «the singer» *(ὁ μελῳδός).* Curiously enough, the period of his life cannot be determined with certainty. Our principal source of information is found in the Greek Menæa, at the feast (Oct. 1) of the Saint. There he is said to have been born in Syria; he was ordained deacon, we are told, at Berytus, and came to Constantinople under the emperor Anastasius, and was assigned to the service of the Blachernæ Church. The words *ἐπὶ τῶν χρόνων Ἀναστασίου τοῦ βασιλέως* may be variously interpreted. Christ and others decide in favor of Anastasius II. Artemius (713—716), while Pitra and others prefer the reign of Anastasius I. (491—518). In the first edition (1897) of his history of Byzantine literature, Krumbacher was for Anastasius I., but since then he has declared (1899) this position to be untenable. De Boor has lately (1900) rallied to the defence of the reign of Anastasius I., as the epoch of the life and work of our Romanos. The chronological problem can be solved only by a more thorough investigation of the writings of Romanos and of his models and his imitators, if such there be. The Menæa say (l. c.) that he composed about one thousand hymns: *κοντάκια ὡς περὶ τὰ χίλια.* About eighty are extant, each made up of twenty-four or more strophes; they have been only partially published. Later hymnographers filled the liturgical books of the Greek Church with their writings, and expelled the works of Romanos, so that of his vast répertoire only a few strophes remained in ecclesiastical use. Nevertheless, his glorious Christmas hymn, *ἡ παρθένος σήμερον,* maintained its place, and as late as the twelfth century was sung with great ceremony at the

Christmas-eve banquet in the imperial palace. Modern scholars agree that for poetic gifts, glow of inspiration, depth of sentiment, and soaring diction, Romanos is easily foremost among all the Greek liturgical poets. They regret but one defect, common to all Byzantine literature: his rhetorical prolixity. Krumbacher believes that in the future history of literature, Romanos will be proclaimed the greatest of all ecclesiastical poets.

Of fundamental importance for the study of the history of Greek hymnography is the Anthologia graeca carminum christianorum. Adornaverunt *W. Christ* et *M. Paranikas,* Leipzig, 1871; still more so the Analecta sacra Spicilegio Solesmensi parata, ed. *J. B. Pitra,* tom. i, Paris, 1876. *Pitra* had already published his Hymnographie de l'église grecque, Rome, 1867. On other collections of Greek ecclesiastical hymns see *K. Krumbacher,* Gesch. der byzant. Lit., pp. 656 ff.; cf. *J. L. Jacobi,* Zur Geschichte des griechischen Volksliedes, in Zeitschr. für Kirchengeschichte (1881—1882), v. 177—250, a very instructive account of the first volume of *Pitra's* Analecta Sacra. *W. Meyer,* Anfang und Ursprung der lateinischen und griechischen rhythmischen Dichtung, Munich, 1885; *Id.,* in Sitzungsberichte der kgl. bayer. Akad. der Wissensch., philos.-philol. Kl. (1896), pp. 49—66, and in Festschrift zur Feier des hundertfünfzigjährigen Bestehens der kgl. Gesellschaft der Wissensch. zu Göttingen, Berlin, 1901, pp. 146 f. *Edm. Bouvy,* Poètes et Mélodes. Etude sur les origines du rhythme tonique dans l'hymnographie de l'église grecque (Thèse), Nîmes, 1886. *F. Cabrol,* L'hymnographie de l'église grecque, Angers, 1893. — Among the hymnologists of the fifth century are: Anthimus, Timocles, Marcian, Johannes Monachus, Seta, Auxentius. It is possible that in the immense collection of Greek hymns by anonymous writers, there may be many pieces belonging to the fifth century. In the Vita S. Auxentii (*Migne,* PG., cxiv. 1377—1436), written by a certain George, a disciple of the Saint, there is a hymn of St. Auxentius, who was archimandrite of a Bithynian monastery about the middle of the fifth century; cf. *Pitra,* Analecta sacra, i, pp. xxi—xxiv; *Bouvy,* l. c., pp. 230—234. A shorter life was lately edited by *L. Clugnet,* Vie de St. Auxence, in Echos d'Orient (1903), vii. 1—14. We have already mentioned (§ 102, 4) a hymn of the emperor Justinian. — *Christ* and *Paranikas,* l. c., pp. 131—138, give but one hymn of St. Romanos, that on the Apostles; cf. Proleg., pp. li—lii. *Pitra,* Analecta sacra, i. 1—241, gives twenty-nine hymns of «the Singer»; cf. Proleg., pp. xxv—xxxi. In 1888 *Pitra* published three other hymns in a jubilee-offering to Leo XIII.: Al Sommo Pontefice Leone XIII. Omaggio Giubilare della Biblioteca Vaticana, Rome, 1888. Later discoveries are to be seen in *Krumbacher,* Studien zu Romanos (Sitzungsberichte der kgl. bayer. Akad.), Munich, 1898; Umarbeitungen bei Romanos mit einem Anhang über das Zeitalter des Romanos (ib.), Munich, 1899. The conclusions of this appendix as to the date of Romanos were opposed by *de Boor,* in Byzant. Zeitschr. (1900), ix. 633—640. *Krumbacher* is preparing a complete edition of all the extant writings of Romanos. For further information concerning Romanos cf. *Jacobi,* l. c., pp. 203—207 220—222; *Bouvy,* l. c., pp. 367—375; *Krumbacher,* Gesch. der byzant. Lit., pp. 663 to 671; *Id.,* Romanos und Kyriacos (§ 104, 1), Munich, 1901 (reprint from the Sitzungsberichte). *S. Vailhé,* St. Roman le Mélode, in Echos d'Orient (1902), v. 207—212 (the poet belongs to the eighth century. *P. van den Ven,* Encore Romanos le Mélode, in Byzant. Zeitschr. (1903), xii. 153—166.

2. SERGIUS. — Sergius, patriarch of Constantinople (610—638), is the founder of Monotheletism which, as its name indicates, teaches that there is *one* will in Christ *(ἓν θέλημα)* and *one* divine-human energy *(μία θεανδρικὴ ἐνέργεια)*, hoping by this concession to win back the Monophysites to ecclesiastical unity. It is Sergius and not, as was formerly believed, Georgius Pisides (see no. 4), who wrote the most celebrated of all the hymns of the Greek Church, the so-called «Greek *Te Deum*»: *(ὕμνος) ἀκάθιστος*. It is a hymn of thanksgiving to the Blessed Virgin for the miraculous deliverance, through her intercession, of Constantinople and the empire from the Avars (626). The name *ἀκάθιστος* indicates that both clergy and laity remained standing while it was sung; other hymns were known as the *καθίσματα*, because while they were sung the laity and clergy were usually seated. Jacobi says of this magnificent hymn: All that enthusiasm for the Blessed Virgin, knowledge of biblical types, and in general of religious objects and thoughts, could contribute; all that could be added in the shape of elegant diction, graceful expression, artistic rhythm and rhyme, has in this hymn been attained in a degree hitherto unequalled.

There are new editions of the Acathistus hymn in *Christ* and *Paranikas*, Anthologia graeca, pp. 140—147: *Pitra*, Analecta sacra, i. 250—262. *P de Meester*, L'inno acatisto (Ἀκάθιστος ὕμνος), in Bessarione, 1904, pp. 134 to 143. For a criticism of the hymn cf. *Jacobi*, l. c., pp. 228—232. A second Acathistus hymn: De b. Virginis transitu (*Pitra*, l. c., pp. 263 to 272) so closely resembles the hymn of Sergius, that it might well be attributed to the same period and the same author. Two letters of Sergius to Cyrus, bishop of Phasis among the Lazi, and to Pope Honorius, are found amid the acts of the Sixth Ecumenical Council (*Mansi*, SS. Conc. Coll., xi. 525—528 529—537). Sergius is also the author of the Ecthesis (exposition of faith) issued in 638 by the emperor Heraclius, and preserved in the acts of the Lateran Synod of 649 (*Mansi*, l. c., x. 991—997). It prohibited the use of the terms μία ἐνέργεια and δύο ἐνέργειαι, and declared that in Christ there was but one will: ἓν θέλημα. In both these letters Sergius appeals to a letter of Mennas, patriarch of Constantinople († 552), to Pope Vigilius, in which Mennas taught the doctrine of one will: ἓν τὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ θέλημα καὶ μίαν ζωοποιὸν ἐνέργειαν. This (lost) letter was very probably spurious, perhaps a forgery by Sergius himself. Cf. *Hefele*, Konziliengeschichte, 2. ed., ii. 855 ff.; iii. 130. The controversy, after all, had begun before the time of Sergius. For the Monothelite writers see *A. Ehrhard*, in *Krumbacher*, Gesch. der byzant. Lit., pp. 60 f. — Between Romanos and Sergius *Pitra* (l. c., pp. 224—226; Proleg., xxxiii f.) places the grandiose funeral hymn (canticum in mortuorum exequiis) of a certain Anastasius, a poet otherwise unknown. For some partial versions see *Jacobi*, l. c., pp. 224—226. In the Revue de l'Orient Latin (1901), vi. 444—452, S. Pétrides identifies this Anastasius with the Sinaita (§ 107, 4).

3. SOPHRONIUS. — In Sophronius, patriarch of Jerusalem (634 to 638), Monotheletism found an opponent at once vigorous and influential (§ 104, 2). Long before his elevation to the patriarchal see, Sophronius had with much energy defended the creed of Chal-

cedon. The first act of his administration was to issue a long and learned synodal letter in which he explained and defended the two wills in Christ. A large work in which he collected, in two books, six hundred «*testimonia antiquorum*» in favor of the two wills or energies in Christ has perished. Several of his homilies have been preserved. They treat of ecclesiastical feasts; Christmas, the Annunciation, the Presentation in the Temple (Hypante or Hypapante), and others. Their doctrinal contents are very remarkable, and also their oratorical style. The homily on the Annunciation merits attention because of its length and of its contents. Sophronius can also claim a place among the Greek ecclesiastical poets. There is extant a collection of his Anacreontic odes: Ἀνακρεόντεια, twenty-three in number, in praise of the feasts of the Church. They are meditations of a profound theologian and as such were meant for a restricted circle of readers. Other poetical effusions are current under his name, rhythmic hymns for liturgical uses, known as ἰδιόμελα, or hymns sung to a special melody. Paranikas has shown that the rhythmic hymns edited by Cardinal Mai under the title of *Τριῴδιον* and attributed by him to Sophronius, are really the composition of Joseph the Hymnographer, in the ninth century. In general it may be said that the works current under the name of Sophronius await a critical revision.

The Epistola synodica of Sophronius is found in *Mansi,* SS. Conc. Coll., xi. 461—510; and in *Migne,* PG., lxxxvii 3, 3147—3200. Cf. *Hefele,* Konziliengeschichte, 2. ed., iii. 159—166. The larger anti-Monothelite work is mentioned by Stephen, bishop of Dora (in Palestine), in his report to the Lateran Synod of 649 (*Mansi,* l. c., x. 895). Nine homilies of Sophronius are found in *Migne,* PG., lxxxvii 3, 3201—3364); some are given only in a Latin version; of the ἐγκώμιον on St. John the Evangelist only two small fragments are printed (Ib., lxxxvii 3, 3363—3364). The Oratio (Ib., lxxxvii 3, 4001—4004) is clearly only a fragment of an Epiphany homily. *H. Usener* has edited the Greek text of two homilies that are (in Latin only) in Migne: the first is a Christmas homily (Dec. 25., 634; Ib., lxxxvii 3, 3201 to 3212), and was published by *Usener,* in Rhein. Museum f. Philol., new series (1886), xli. 500—516; cf. *Id.,* Religionsgeschichtl. Untersuchungen, Bonn, 1889, i. 326 ff. The second is a homily on the Presentation of our Lord (Ib., lxxxvii 3, 3287—3302) and was published as a university program (Bonn, 1889), with notes on the Greek diction of the writer. *Usener* also proved in his edition of the Acts of the Persian martyr Anastasius (Bonn-program, 1894) that the sermon on Anastasius (Ib., xcii. 1679 to 1730) hitherto attributed to Georgius Pisides (see no. 4), is really the work of Sophronius. In the Ἀνάλεκτα ἱεροσολυμιτικῆς σταχυολογίας, St. Petersburg, 1898, v. 151—168, *A. Papadopulos-Kerameus* published a new sermon of Sophronius on baptism. Apart from his homilies and sermons and the lives of Saints already mentioned, the following works are printed in Migne under the name of Sophronius: De peccatorum confessione, περὶ ἐξαγγελιῶν (PG., lxxxvii 3, 3365—3372), De baptismate apostolorum (Ib., lxxxvii 3, 3371 to 3372), Fragmentum dogmaticum (Ib., lxxxvii 3, 4011—4012), an incomplete commentary on the liturgy or Commentarius liturgicus (Ib., lxxxvii 3, 3981

to 4002), and a little work in Latin which is considered to be spurious: De laboribus, certaminibus et peregrinationibus SS. Petri et Pauli (Ib., lxxxvii 3, 4011—4014). In the (Russian) Annals of the Historico-philological Society of Odessa (1894), *N. Th. Krasnojeljcev* investigated the liturgical commentary and proved it a forgery; cf. *Ehrhard,* in *Krumbacher,* Gesch. d. byzant. Lit., 2. ed., p. 190. The following poems of Sophronius are in Migne: the Anacreontica (Ib., lxxxvii 3, 3733—3838), the Triodium (Ib., lxxxvii 3, 3839 to 3982), the Troparium horarum (Ib., lxxxvii 3, 4005—4010), Epitaphia Eulogii et Joannis Eleemos., Alexandrinorum praesulum (Ib., lxxxvii 3, 4009—4010). On the origin of the Triodium see *Paranikas,* Beiträge zur byzant. Lit., Munich, 1870, pp. 1—22. An Anacreontic ode (no. 14) lacking in Migne, was edited by *L. Ehrhard,* in a program of the Strassburg Gymnasium (1887). Three Anacreontic odes were published by *Christ* and *Paranikas,* in Anthologia graeca (pp. 43—47; cf. Proleg., pp. xxvii f.) under the name of Sophronius, also two of his Idiomela (pp. 96—97; cf. p. liii). For a description and an appreciation of the Anacreontica cf. *Bouvy,* l. c. (see no. 1), pp. 169—182. *S. Vailhé,* Sophrone le sophiste et Sophrone le patriarche, in Revue de l'Orient chrétien (1902), vii. 360—363, and (1903), viii. 32—69. — Modestus, the predecessor (631—634) of Sophronius in the see of Jerusalem, left a panegyric on the bodily assumption of the Blessed Virgin into heaven: ἐγκώμιον εἰς τὴν κοίμησιν τῆς ὑπεραγίας δεσποίνης ἡμῶν θεοτόκου καὶ ἀειπαρθένου Μαρίας (*Migne,* PG., lxxxvi 2, 3277 to 3312). Photius (Bibl. Cod. 275) has preserved brief excerpts from two other homilies of Modestus. — Zacharias, the predecessor (609—631) of Modestus, taken prisoner by the Persian king Chosroes but liberated by Heraclius, has left us an encyclical composed during his captivity (Ib., lxxxvi 2, 3227—3234). He is also credited with the authorship of a work entitled: De persica captivitate (Ib., lxxxvi 2, 3235—3268).

4. GEORGIUS PISIDES. — A highly gifted and prolific poet arose in the person of George of Pisidia, a contemporary of Sergius and Sophronius, deacon and custodian of the Sacristy (skenophylax), according to others archivist (chartophylax), of Sancta Sophia at Constantinople. His poetry is composed according to the laws of quantitative metre, and in iambic trimeter, usually in dodecasyllabic lines. His verse is fluent and very correct, his narrative simple and easily understood. Three of his larger poems deal with political events: the victories of Heraclius (610—641) over the Persians: *εἰς τὴν κατὰ Περσῶν ἐκστρατείαν Ἡρακλείου τοῦ βασιλέως*, in 1088 verses; the siege of Constantinople by the Avars (626) and their defeat: *εἰς τὴν γενομένην ἔφοδον τῶν βαρβάρων καὶ εἰς τὴν αὐτῶν ἀστοχίαν*, in 541 verses, and the final victory of the emperor over Chosroes: *Ἡρακλιὰς ἤτοι εἰς τὴν τελείαν πτῶσιν Χοσρόου βασιλέως Περσῶν*, in 471 verses. Three other poems are didactic and edifying in character: on the creation of the world, *ἑξαήμερον ἢ κοσμουργία*, in 1910 verses, (in Hercher's edition, 1894 verses), probably incomplete, on the vanity of human life: *εἰς τὸν μάταιον βίον*, in 262 verses (also a fragment), and against Severus (§ 102, 2), the Monophysite patriarch of Antioch: *κατὰ δυσσεβοῦς Σευήρου Ἀντιοχείας*, in 726 verses. He is the author also of a hymn: *εἰς τὴν ἁγίαν ἀνάστασιν τοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν*, and of many epigrams and fragments.

A complete edition of his works was published by *J. M. Querci,* Rome, 1777. The three historical carmina were published by *J. Bekker,* Bonn, 1837 (Corpus Script. hist. Byzant.). The contents of both editions are reprinted in *Migne,* PG., xcii. 1161—1754. Georgii Pisidae carmina inedita were edited by *L. Sternbach,* in Wiener Studien (1891), xiii. 1 ff.; (1892), xiv. 51 ff. The Hexaemeron was edited, with many corrections, by *R. Hercher,* in the appendix to his edition of the work of the Sophist Aelianus († after 222), Leipzig, 1864—1866. An Armenian version of the Hexaemeron is probably the work of Stephen, bishop of Siuniq (eighth century); it was edited by *J. H. A. Tiroean,* Venice, 1900. In Wiener Studien (1886), viii. 292—304; (1887), ix. 207—222, *J. Hilberg* explained the metre of Georgius Pisides, and contributed to the textual criticism of his writings. On his merits as a poet, cf. *Bouvy,* l. c. (see no. 1), pp. 164 to 169. We have seen that the Hymnus Acathistus is the work of Sergius, not of Georgius Pisides (see no. 2), also that Sophronius, and not our Georgius, is the author of the prose oration on the Persian martyr Anastasius (see no. 3). *L. Sternbach,* De Georgii Pisidae apud Theophanem aliosque historicos reliquiis; De Georgii Pisidae fragmentis a Suida servatis; Observationes in Georgii Pisidae carmina historica, Cracow, 1899—1900.

5. ANDREW OF CRETE. — The rhythmic poetry of the Greek liturgy received a new development through the so-called Canons, *κανόνες,* or hymns each of which is made up of nine odes, each ode being in turn variously subdivided. The invention of these new hymns is attributed to Andrew, a native of Damascus, who flourished in the latter half of the seventh century, and was for several years a monk in Jerusalem and secretary to the patriarch of that town (Hierosolymitanus). He was made archbishop of Crete before 711 and died about 720. Under Constantine IV Pogonatus (668—685) he appears as a defender of the orthodox faith against the Monotheletes; under Philippicus Bardanes (711—713) he is said to have gone over to that heresy, but to have returned to the true faith. after the death of that emperor. In the reign of Leo the Isaurian (717—741) he appears as a defender of the veneration of images. He is honored as a Saint in the Greek Church. Besides several comprehensive discourses, we owe to his prolific pen many homilies on the Mother of God, also numerous Idiomela (see no. 3) and «canons». His most renowned composition is the «Great Canon», *ὁ μέγας κανών,* a hymn of penance and compunction, in no less than two hundred and fifty strophes. While his interminable prolixity and repetition of the same thoughts are extremely fatiguing, it must be admitted that he exhibits genuine emotion and a certain robustness of expression. In general, his poetry is didactic and reflective; but amid so many lengthy dogmatic definitions, and innumerable antitheses, metaphors and verbal juggleries, one misses the natural sublimity of the earlier melodists.

The printed works of St. Andrew are in *Migne,* PG., xcvii. 789—1444. *Christ* and *Paranikas* republished in their Anthologia graeca the first of

the four parts of the Great Canon (147—157), also a «Canon» of doubtful authenticity on the feast of the Chains of St. Peter (157—161). A hitherto unknown sermon of St. Andrew on James, the apostle and brother of the Lord, was published by *A. Papadopulos-Kerameus,* in Ἀνάλεκτα ἱεροσολυμιτικῆς σταχυολογίας, St. Petersburg, 1891, pp. 1—14. Cf. *F. Haussleiter,* in Zeitschrift für Kirchengesch. (1893—1894), xiv. 73—76. A fragment of a new homily of St. Andrew is published in the Πατμιακὴ βιβλιοθήκη of the Philological Society of Athens (1890), pp. 330—331; cf. *H. Heissenberg,* in Byzant. Zeitschr. (1901), x. 505—514. From an iambic poem of St. Andrew, published (ib.) by *Heissenberg,* the latter concludes that our author renounced Monotheletism for the orthodox faith. *S. Vailhé* discourses on the relations of St. Andrew with the Monotheletes and his return to orthodoxy, and places his death on July 4., 740: St. André de Crète, in Echos d'Orient (1902), v. 372—387. See also *E. Marin,* in Dict. de Théologie, Paris, 1903, i. 1182—1184.

6. ST. JOHN OF DAMASCUS AND COSMAS THE SINGER. — Andrew found many imitators, though the prolixity of his «canons» was felt to be intolerable. The nine odes were soon reduced to a smaller number of strophes. The most celebrated versifiers in the new style are John of Damascus and his adopted brother Cosmas the Singer. We shall deal elsewhere at length with the life of the former § 108, 2. Both Cosmas and John enjoyed the benefit of an excellent education at the hands of a Sicilian monk, also known as Cosmas, whom the father of John had freed from captivity among the Saracens, and who was a profound scholar both in theology and profane science[1] Both John and his brother Cosmas entered the famous monastery of St. Saba, near Jerusalem; the former was destined to die within its walls, while the latter became eventually bishop of Majuma in Phenicia (743); the date of his death is unknown. His sojourn at St. Saba procured for Cosmas the name of *Hierosolymitanus* or *Hagiopolites* (Hieropolites), though he is more usually known as «the singer», *ὁ μελῳδός*. Both John and Cosmas agree in sacrificing to an artistic and ornate versification the imaginative boldness and lucidity of diction characteristic of the earlier liturgical poets; they even surpass Andrew of Crete as masters of refinement, variety, and technical skill in the treatment of language. The faultless Hellenic verse of Gregory of Nazianzus was their model. Indeed, Cosmas wrote «scholia» on the poems of the Nazianzene. His Canons and Odes, like those of his brother John, celebrate generally the feasts of our Lord. Protest has lately been entered against the traditional opinion that John composed the Octoechos, an official collection of liturgical hymns for Sunday services still used by the Greek Church. Though in warmth of sentiment and splendor of diction John is much superior to his adopted brother, he is no less than Cosmas the slave of a minute and wearisome stylistic dexterity. He revived the use of quantita-

[1] Vita S. Ioan. Damasc., c. 9, a work probably composed by John VI., patriarch of Jerusalem († about 969).

tive metre; at least of three of his «canons», those on Christmas Theophany (Epiphany), and Pentecost, are in iambic trimeters (se no. 4). At the same time he is faithful to the new technique, fo his verse is also accentuated rhythmically. In their predilectio for clever linguistic artifice the later Byzantines came to admire Joh and Cosmas as the princes of Greek hymnography Suidas asserts that there never was, and never will be, anything comparable to th «Canons» of John and Cosmas: *σύγκρισιν οὐκ ἐδέξαντο οὐδὲ δέξαιντ ἄν, μέχρις ὁ καθ' ἡμᾶς βίος περαιωθήσεται.*

The poems of St. John of Damascus are collected in *Migne,* PG., xcv 817—856 1363—1408; the «Canons», printed Ib., xcvi. 1371—1408, firs edited by *Mai,* Spicilegium Romanum, ix. 713—739, are certainly spurious probably the work of a younger Johannes Monachus; cf. *Christ* et *Par nikas,* Anthologia graeca, Proleg., p. xlvii; there are (pp. 117—121) si small poems and (pp. 205—236) eight «canons» of St. John. The thre metrical «canons» (pp. 205—217) were lately revised by *A. Nauck,* i Mélanges Gréco-Romains, St. Petersburg, 1894, pp. 199—223. Cf. *P. Rocch* In paracleticam Deiparae Sanctissimae S. Johanni Damasceno vulgo tr butam animadversiones, in Bessarione (1902), vi, series II, vol. iii. 22—3 194—210; vol. iv. 217—234; (1903—1904), viii. 48—55 177—186 (ver little belongs to the Damascene). — The catalogue of the poetical work of St. Cosmas is not yet fixed with certainty; there is even reason t doubt the genuineness of some compositions ascribed to him. His maste Cosmas was also a liturgical poet, and it is very often difficult to di tinguish to which Cosmas the manuscripts mean to attribute the poem handed down under that name. *Migne* gives (PG., xcviii) thirteen hym Cosmae Hierosolymitani (459—514) and eleven aliae odae Cosmae monach (513—524). *Christ* and *Paranikas* (l. c., pp. 161—204) publish fourtee «canons» under the name of Cosmas the younger; cf. also *Pitra,* Analect sacra, i. 410—412 527—529. The scholia of Cosmas Junior on the poem of Gregory of Nazianzus are reprinted in *Mai,* Spicileg. Rom., ii 2, 1 t 373; *Migne,* PG., xxxviii. 339—679. — Theodori Prodromi commentaric in carmina sacra melodorum Cosmae Hierosolymitani et Joannis Damascen ad fidem codd. mss. primum edidit *H. M. Stevenson* Senior. Praefatu est *J. B. Pitra,* Rome, 1888.

### § 106. Exegetes. Canonists. Ascetics.

1. EXEGETES. — About 520, as it seems, Andrew, archbisho of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, wrote a commentary on the Apocalypse[1] It possesses a special interest as being the oldest Greek interpretatio of the Apocalypse that has reached us; it contains, moreover, th complete Greek text of the book. We know, also, but only fron manuscript-catalogues, that he composed a work on the Book c Daniel, and another work entitled *θεραπευτική*. Olympiodorus, deacon of Alexandria in the first half of the sixth century, seem to have written a number of works illustrative of several biblica books. A published commentary on Ecclesiastes bears his name[3]

[1] Lexicon, rec. *Bernhardy,* i 2, 1029. [2] *Migne,* PG., cvi. 215—458.
[3] Ib., xciii. 477—628.

there is also extant a manuscript copy of his commentary on Jeremias. Fragments of this commentary are doubtless scattered through the numerous short scholia attributed to an otherwise obscure Olympiodorus in the Greek Catena on Jeremias, Lamentations, and Baruch, edited by *M. Ghisler*[1]. *Migne* also attributes to an Olympiodorus some scholia on Job[2], on Proverbs[3], and a brief fragment on Luke vi. 23[4]. The authenticity of these fragments, or rather the identity of their author with our Olympiodorus awaits confirmation. — A certain Peter of Laodicea, said to belong to the seventh century, composed Catena-like commentaries on the four Gospels, some fragments of which have been published[5]. It may be suspected from one of these fragments that Peter's commentary on Mark is identical with the commentary on Mark published by Chr. Fr. Matthæi (Moscow, 1775) and attributed by him to Victor of Antioch (§ 99, 6). — Anastasius III., patriach of Nicæa about 700, left a commentary on the Psalms that awaits an editor.

The Greek text of the commentary on the Apocalypse by Andrew of Cæsarea was first published by *Fr Sylburg,* Heidelberg, 1596. It is also printed in *A. Cramer,* Catena in epistolas catholicas, Oxford, 1840, pp. 497 to 582, under the name of Oecumenius, conjectured to have been bishop of Tricca in Thessaly. *Migne* (PG., cvi. 7—8) erroneously places Andrew in the ninth century; cf. *Fr. Diekamp,* in Hist. Jahrbuch (1897), xviii. 1—36, cf. pp. 602 f., and ib., p. 34, for traces of other writings of Andrew of Cæsarea. Since 1901 the personality of Oecumenius has become better known through Diekamp's discovery of his commentary on the Apocalypse. Cf. *S. Vailhé,* Dictionnaire de Théologie, Paris, 1908, iii. 1181. It seems that this author was a Severian Monophysite, also a partisan of the Origenistic apocatastasis, and that he flourished about 600. Andrew of Crete is alleged to have been acquainted with his commentary on the Apocalypse and to have utilized it. If this were true, the date of 520 for the work of Andrew of Cæsarea would have to be abandoned. It follows also that the other works attributed to Oecumenius cannot belong to him; cf. *Dickamp,* in Sitzungsberichte der kgl. Akad. der Wissensch., Berlin, 1901, pp. 1046—1056; *S. Pétrides,* Oecumenius de Tricca, ses œuvres, son culte, in Echos d' Orient (1903), vii. 307—310. — The date of Olympiodorus, formerly calculated in various ways, is now rendered certain by the signature of a manuscript of his commentary on Jeremias belonging to the Barberini Library at Rome: *S. de Magistris*, Acta martyrum ad Ostia Tiberina sub Claudio Gothico, Rome, 1795, pp. 286 f. In this manuscript Olympiodorus is called «a deacon of Alexandria, ordained by John Nikiotes (Νικιώτης), archbishop of Alexandria». The Monophysite patriarch of Alexandria John III., called ὁ Νικειότης or Νικαιώτης (of Nikiu?) died in May 516, after administering the see for eleven years; cf. *A. v. Gutschmid,* Kleine Schriften, herausgegeben von *Fr Rühl,* Leipzig, 1890, ii. 456 f. The Catena on Job, republished completely in *Migne,* PG., xciii. 13—470, does not belong in its entirety to Olympiodorus, as was imagined by *P. Comitolus* who translated the Catena into Latin (Lyons, 1586;

[1] Lyons, 1623; cf. *Migne,* PG., xciii. 627—780. [2] Ib., 13—470 passim.
[3] Ib., 469—478, in Latin only. [4] Ib., 779—780.
[5] Ib., lxxxvi 2, 3321—3336.

Venice, 1587). It is rather a work of Nicetas, bishop of Serrae and after wards metropolitan of Heraclea, in the eleventh century, a discovery owing to *P Junius,* the first editor of the Greek text (London, 1637). — On the patriarch Anastasius III. of Nicæa cf. *M. Le Quien,* Oriens christianus Paris, 1740, i. 644. *A. Lauriotes* describes in Ἐκκλησιαστικὴ Ἀλήθεια June 26., 1892, pp. 134—135, a (mutilated) manuscript of his commentary on the Psalms.

2. CANONISTS. — As early as the sixth century the Greeks felt the need of a compendious and systematic collection of ecclesiastical legislation. The oldest of the extant canonical collections is that of Johannes Scholasticus in fifty tituli, compiled, it seems, while he was still a layman. In 565 Justinian made him patriarch of Constantinople, a position which he held until his death in 577, while the legitimate patriarch Eutychius (§ 104, 3) was obliged to live in exile During his term of office John issued a second and enlarged edition of his collection of canons, and added to it selected enactments from the Novellæ of Justinian in eighty-seven chapters; from the re-arrangement and fusion of these two works arose the first so-called Nomocanon or collection of civil and ecclesiastical laws; it is worthy of note that the actual form of the Nomocanon can no longer be attributed to the patriarch John as his personal work. Photius had read[1] a *κατηχητικὸς λόγος* of Johannes Scholasticus on the Trinity composed in 566. Another Nomocanon formerly attributed to Photius[2], was composed, according to later researches, in the seventh century, and can only have been re-edited by Photius († about 891) — A much older collection of canons, in sixty tituli, is mentioned by Johannes Scholasticus in the preface to his first work, but it has perished since then. — After the death of St. Eutychius (582), John IV the Faster (*ὁ νηστευτής*, ieiunator), was made patriarch of Constantinople (582—595). He is best known by reason of the controversies that arose between him and the popes Pelagius II. and Gregory I. apropos of his arrogant assumption of the title of «universal patriarch». He was formerly accredited with the authorship of a long Pœnitentiale, or instruction for the presbyter-penitentiary in the administration of his office: *ἀκολουθία καὶ τάξις ἐπὶ ἐξομολογουμένων*[3] Binterim has shown that it is a spurious work and belongs to a much later period. A Sermo ad eos qui peccatorum confessionem patri suo spirituali edituri sunt[4] is merely an excerpt from this Pœnitentiale; a Sermo de pœnitentia et continentia et virginitate[5] is elsewhere attributed to St. Chrysostom. Cardinal Pitra published under the name of John the Faster a Doctrina monialium et pœnae pro singulis peccatis, together with other minor writings. The: Rescriptum

[1] Bibl. Cod. 75. [2] *Migne,* PG, civ. 975—1218.
[3] Ib., lxxxviii. 1889—1918; cf. 1931—1936. [4] Ib., lxxxviii. 1919—1932.
[5] Ib., lxxxviii. 1937—1978.

de sacramento baptismatis, addressed by the patriarch to Leander of Seville[1], seems to have perished.

The Collection of Canons (second edition) of Johannes Scholasticus was edited by *G. Voelli* et *H. Justelli,* Bibl. iur. can. vet., Paris, 1661, ii. 499—602. The excerpts from the Novellae were first edited by *G. E. Heimbach,* Ἀνέκδοτα, Leipzig, 1840, ii. 202—234. For supplements to both editions cf. *J. B. Pitra,* Iuris eccles. Graecorum hist. et monum., Rome, 1868, ii. 368 ff., and *J. Hergenröther,* Archiv f. kathol. Kirchenrecht (1870), xxiii. 208 ff. The first Nomocanon is printed in *Voelli* and *Justelli,* l. c., ii. 603—660; a new edition of it is in *Pitra,* l. c., ii. 416—420. The Nomocanon formerly attributed to Photius is in *Voelli* et *Justelli,* l. c., ii. 813 to 1140; a new edition in *Pitra,* l. c., ii. 433—640; cf. *Hergenröther,* l. c., 211 ff. *E. Zachariae v. Lingenthal,* Die griechischen Nomokanones, St. Petersburg, 1877; *Id.,* Über den Verfasser und die Quellen des (pseudo-photianischen) Nomokanon in XIV Titeln, ib., 1885. — The Poenitentiale formerly attributed to John the Faster is discussed by *A. J. Binterim,* Die vorzüglichsten Denkwürdigkeiten der christkatholischen Kirche, Mainz, 1829, v 3, 383—390; *K. Holl,* Enthusiasmus und Bußgewalt beim griech. Mönchtum, Leipzig, 1898, pp. 289—298. *S. Haidacher,* Chrysostomus-Excerpte in der Rede des Johannes Nesteutes über die Buße, in Zeitschr. für kath. Theol. (1902), xxvi. 380—385. Other writings attributed to this author are found in *Pitra,* Spicilegium Solesmense, Paris, 1858, iv. 416—444; *Id.,* Iuris eccles. Graec. hist. et monum. ii. 222—237. On his controversies with the contemporary popes cf. *H. Grisar,* in Zeitschr. für kath. Theol. (1880), iv. 468—523; *Id.,* Storia di Roma e dei Papi del Medio Evo, Part III, Rome, 1899, pp. 222—240, and *Hergenröther,* Photius, i.

3. ASCETICS. — St. John Climacus owes his fame and his surname to an ascetic work known as «The Ladder *(κλῖμαξ)*[2]. It describes, under the image of a ladder, the gradual development and continuous perfection of the soul consecrated to God. In keeping with the thirty years of our Lord's life it enumerates as many steps in the way of Christian progress. In the little treatise «To the Shepherd» *(πρὸς τὸν ποιμένα)*[3], an appendix to «The Ladder», the pastoral office is put before the monastic superior as his true ideal; the previous and larger work was meant for the instruction of the monks. Both were composed at the request of a friend and admirer, also named John, superior of a monastery at Raithu on the shore of the Gulf of Suez, some eighteen miles southwest of Mount Sinai. To a (contemporaneous) monk of this monastery, a certain Daniel, we owe what information we possess concerning John Climacus. The latter was born about 525, and entered the monastery of Mount Sinai at the age of sixteen; later on he retired to a solitary cell and finally to a cavern at the foot of the mountain. He had lived, as a hermit for forty years when the fame of his virtue and learning (hence he is known as Scholasticus) induced the monks of Mount Sinai to choose him for their abbot (hence he is known as Sinaita).

[1] *Isid. Hispal.,* De viris ill., c. 39.
[2] *Migne,* PG lxxxviii. 631—1164.
[3] Ib., lxxxviii. 1165—1210.

Before his death, which took place about 600, he again retired to th solitude. His two works became famous in due time. The «Ladder» in particular attracted the attention of several commentators. Th best work of this kind is the «Scholia» of Johannes of Raithu[1]. — About 620, Antiochus, a monk of St. Saba near Jerusalem, made a collection of moral sentences in one hundred and thirty chapters, drawn mostly from Scripture and the writings of the Fathers. The Latin translator erroneously described them as so many homilies. The work bore the title «Pandects of Sacred Scripture»: *πανδέκτης τῆς ἁγία γραφῆς*[2], and was meant to serve as a manual of piety for the monks of the cloister of Attaline near Ancyra, whom the Persian invasion had compelled to wander from place to place, and therefore to live without books. A prayer: *περὶ προσευχῆς καὶ ἐξομολογήσεως*[3], describes the sufferings of Jerusalem at the time of its conquest by the Persians (614) and begs God to remove from the holy place the abomination of their rule. — Dorotheus, also an abbot in Palestine about the beginning of the seventh century, is held to be the author of twenty-four didactico-ascetic tracts for monks: *διδασκαλίαι ψυχωφελεῖς διάφοροι*[4]: De renuntiatione, De humilitate, De conscientia, De divino timore, Non debere quemquam suae prudentiae confidere etc. The last treatise: De compositione monachi, is existant in Latin only; it is followed by the Greek text[5] of eight short letters containing instructions and counsels for monks.

The editio princeps of both works of St. John Climacus was brought out by *Matth. Raderus,* S. J., Paris, 1633; in his Isagoge he included the life of our author by the monk Daniel. This edition is in *Migne,* PG., lxxxviii; the scholia of Abbot John are ib., 1211—1248, but only in Latin, re-printed from Max. Bibl. vet. Patr., Lyons, 1677, x. 507—520. The Greek text of both works was edited anew by *Sophronios Eremites,* Constantinople 1883. See a German translation in «Leitsterne auf der Bahn des Heils» Landshut, 1834, vii; 2. ed. (contains only the «Ladder»), Ratisbon, 1874; in Byzant. Zeitschr. (1902), xi. 35—37, *F. Nau* discusses the chronology of the life of Climacus and modifies considerably the received dates; he concludes that he was born before 579 and died about 649; cf. *Fessler-Jungmann* Instit. Patrol. ii 2, 452—459. — The Greek text of the «Pandects» of Antiochus was edited by *Fronto Ducaeus,* Paris, 1624. Many fragments of earlier patristic writings were saved by their incorporation into the compilation of Antiochus (§ 8, 4); on the whimsical theory of Cotterill that Antiochus was the author of the Letter of Polycarp, see § 10, 2. — On Dorotheus and his writings cf. *Oudin,* Comment. de Script. eccles. i. 1626 to 1636, and *Fabricius-Harles,* Bibl. Gr., xi. 103—108. — Thalassius, abbot of a monastery in Libya about 650, left four hundred sententiae distributed in four «centuriae», in pious imitation of the four Gospels; the work is known as: De caritate et continentia necnon de regimine mentis ad Paulum presbyterum (*Migne,* PG., xci. 1427—1470). On the letter to th

[1] Ib., lxxxviii. 1211—1248.
[2] Ib., lxxxix. 1421—1850.
[3] Ib., lxxxix. 1849—1856.
[4] Ib., lxxxviii. 1611—1838.
[5] Ib., lxxxviii. 1837—1842.

emperor Theodosius, erroneously printed (Ib., xci. 1471—1480) as eiusdem Thalassii libellus ad Theodos. imp., see § 77, 12. — It is possible that the bishop (?) John of Carpathus (an island between Crete and Rhodes), under whose name two small collections of monastic exhortations are current: Ad monachos in India, eorum rogatu, capita hortatoria sive documenta spiritualia, and Alia capita (Ib., lxxxv. 791—812 811—826; both of them extant in Latin only), belongs to the middle of the seventh century.

### § 107. Dogmatic and polemical writers.

1. ST. ANASTASIUS I. OF ANTIOCH. — He was patriarch of Antioch (559—599), an intimate friend of Gregory the Great, and in trying times a resolute champion of the faith and liberty of the Church. He courageously resisted the last dogmatic edicts of Justinian in favor of Aphthartodocetism[1]. The emperor Justin II. exiled him in 570 and placed Gregory, a monk of Mount Sinai, in the patriarchal chair (§ 103, 3). It was only after the death of the latter (593) that the emperor Maurice, yielding to the repeated and earnest representations of Gregory the Great, permitted Anastasius to return to his see. He is honored by the Church as a Saint. It would seem that most of his writings were composed during his long exile. They have perished in great measure, or have not yet been recognized. Among them were: letters and homilies, a work against John Philoponus (§ 101, 3), «a demonstration of the great and quasi-angelic dignity of the priesthood», and others. Under his name there is extant, but only in a Latin version: De nostris rectis dogmatibus veritatis orationes quinque[2], formally a collection of homilies, but really a dogmatic instruction concerning the Trinity and the Incarnation. These homilies were never orally delivered, but committed to writing during his exile. There are also extant: Sermones quatuor[3], of doubtful authenticity, a Compendiaria orthodoxae fidei explicatio[4], and some fragmenta[5]. Cardinal Pitra added the discourse delivered by Anastasius, March 25., 593, on the occasion of his restoration to the Church of Antioch.

This discourse was edited by *Pitra*, Iuris eccles. Graecorum hist. et monum., Rome, 1868, ii. 251—257. On the works of Anastasius in general cf. *Fabricius-Harles*, Bibl. Gr., x. 595—600 (= *Migne*, PG., lxxxix. 1293 to 1300), and for later manuscript-references *Pitra*, l. c., ii. 243 ff. An edition of the «Demonstration of the grandeur of the priestly dignity», unknown outside of Russia, was described by *A. Papadopulos-Kerameus*, in Ἀνάλεκτα ἱεροσολυμιτικῆς σταχυολογίας, St. Petersburg, 1891, i. 15. — The religious Conference at the Court of the Sassanids, attributed in some manuscripts to Anastasius, patriarch of Antioch, was certainly composed during the fifth century by some unknown person in Asia Minor or Syria.

[1] *Evagr.*, Hist. eccl., iv. 39—41; cf. § 102, 3.
[2] *Migne*, PG., lxxxix. 1309—1362.
[3] Ib., lxxxix. 1361—1398, Greek and Latin.
[4] Ib., lxxxix. 1399—1404. [5] Ib., lxxxix. 1405—1408.

This apologetical romance develops the truth of the Christian religion in an imaginary controversial dialogue, supposed to have taken place in Persia in presence of King Arrhinatus. It has been edited by *A. Vasiliev,* Moscow, 1893; *A. Wirth,* Aus orientalischen Chroniken, Frankfort 1894, pp. 143—210; *E. Bratke,* Leipzig, 1899, in Texte u. Untersuchungen xix, new series, iv, 3 a. Cf. *C. M. Kaufmann,* in Revue d'hist. ecclésiast (1901), ii. 529—548. Cf. *S. Vailhé,* Dict. de Théologie, Paris 1903, i. 1166 — Anastasius II., patriarch of Antioch (599—609), suffered death at the hands of the Jews and is venerated by the Church as a martyr. He translated into Greek the Regula Pastoralis of Gregory the Great (§ 118, 2) but his version seems to have perished; cf. *Pitra,* l. c., ii. 241.

2. ST. EULOGIUS OF ALEXANDRIA. — Quite similar in character was Eulogius, patriarch of Alexandria (580—607), likewise a warm friend of Gregory the Great. The correspondence of the pope contains many flattering expressions of esteem and admiration for the person of the patriarch. The latter devoted himself with particular zeal to the theological refutation of the various Monophysite sects. In the ninth century Photius was acquainted with six books of Eulogius against Novatian and concerning ecclesiastical discipline: *κατὰ Ναυάτου καὶ περὶ οἰκονομίας*[1]; two books against Timothy and Severus *κατὰ Τιμοθέου καὶ Σευήρου*, that contained an exhaustive defence of the Epistola dogmatica of Leo the Great to Flavian[2]; a work against Theodosius and Severus: *κατὰ Θεοδοσίου καὶ Σευήρου,* also a defence of the Epistola dogmatica[3]; a philippic: *στηλιτευτικὸς λόγος* against Theodosians and Gaianites[4], and eleven treatises: *λόγοι*, mostly dogmatico-polemical in character[5]. To-day there are extant only a sermon «on the Palm-branches and the foal of the ass»[6], and several fragments[7], among which may be reckoned the: Capita septem de duabus naturis Domini Deique[8].

The titles of some of these works become clearer when it is remembered that after the death of Timothy, the Monophysite (Severian) patriarch of Alexandria (536), the opposing sects of Severiani and Julianists (§ 99, 3; 102, 2) chose each their own patriarch, the Severians Theodosius, and the Julianists Gaianus. Thereby Severians and Julianists became respectively Theodosians and Gaianites. Extracts from a work of St. Eulogius on the Trinity and incarnation: *περὶ τῆς ἁγίας τριάδος καὶ περὶ τῆς θείας οἰκονομίας*, were published by *O. Bardenhewer,* in Theol. Quartalschr. (1896), lxxviii. 353—401; cf. *J. Stiglmayr,* in Katholik (1897), ii. 93—96. Photius does not mention this work. A fragment of it (the beginning) was edited by Mai, and is found in Migne (l. c., 2939—2944). — Eusebius, bishop of Thessalonica and a contemporary of Gregory the Great dedicated his refutation of Aphthartodocetism to a certain monk Andrew who had been misled by this heresy. Photius describes its ten books (Bibl. Cod. 162). — Early in the seventh century Timotheus, a priest and sacristan (skeuophylax) on Constantinople, composed a little treatise on

[1] Bibl. Cod. 182 208 280. [2] Ib., Cod. 225. [3] Ib., Cod. 226.
[4] Ib., Cod. 227. [5] Ib., Cod. 230.
[6] *Migne,* PG., lxxxvi 2, 2913—2938. [7] Ib., lxxxvi 2, 2937—2964.
[8] Ib., lxxxvi 2, 2937—2940.

the reconciliation of heretics: περὶ τῶν προσερχομένων τῇ ἁγίᾳ ἐκκλησίᾳ (*Migne,* PG., lxxxvi 1, 11—68); it offers an instructive view of the activity of heretics at this time. Timotheus distinguishes three groups of heretics: the first must be baptized, the second must be confirmed, the third needs to abjure its erroneous tenets.

3. ST. MAXIMUS CONFESSOR. — Maximus surnamed «the Confessor», ὁ ὁμολογητής, was one of the first to uphold the banner of the orthodox faith in its conflict with Monotheletism; his name ranks high in the patristic annals of the seventh century His life is shrouded in some obscurity. The anonymous *Vita S. Maximi*[1], written by an unknown admirer of the Saint, is very incomplete. Maximus was the son of noble parents and was born about 580, at Constantinople. His abilities and learning attracted the attention of the emperor Heraclius (610—641), who made him first imperial secretary: πρῶτος ὑπογραφεὺς τῶν βασιλικῶν ὑπομνημάτων. About 630 he abandoned his worldly career and withdrew across the Bosphorus to the monastery of Chrysopolis (now Scutari), where he seems to have soon reached the dignity of abbot. We meet him at Alexandria in 633, in the company of the monk Sophronius, afterwards patriarch of Jerusalem (§ 104, 2; 105, 3). In July 645, he took part in a colloquy held in Northern Africa, probably at Carthage, in presence of the imperial procurator Gregory and many bishops. The subject of this colloquy was Monotheletism, and his principal opponent was Pyrrhus, the Monothelite ex-patriarch of Constantinople. The acts of the discussion are extant[2], and are accounted among the most important documents regarding the Monothelite heresy. Maximus won a signal victory over Pyrrhus; the latter was obliged to acknowledge his error and to accept the doctrine of two wills in Christ. In consequence of this event many diocesan synods were held in Africa and the adjacent islands (646), in which Monotheletism was categorically denounced and rejected. From Africa, Maximus went to Rome where he continued his warfare for the faith of the Church. He it was who induced Pope Martin I. (649—655) to hold the famous Lateran Council of 649, in which Monotheletism and all its adherents were condemned, together with the Ecthesis and the Typus in which edicts, respectively, Heraclius (638) and Constans II. (648) had taken sides with the Monothelites. Constans was violently offended, and poured forth the vials of his wrath both on Pope Martin and his adviser. In the summer of 653 Maximus was imprisoned at Rome with two disciples, the monk Anastasius and the apocrisiarius (envoy) Anastasius. Shortly afterward all three were brought as prisoners to Constantinople. Their trial took place in 655; its proceedings are still preserved[3]. Maximus was exiled to Bizya in Thrace, and his two

[1] *Migne,* PG., xc. 67—110. [2] Ib., xci. 287—354.
[3] Ib., xc. 109—130; PL., cxxix. 603—622.

disciples, respectively, to Perberis and Mesembria. It was in vain that in the following year attempts were made at Bizya to induce Maximus to accept the Typus[1]. Early in 662, the three confessors were brought back to Constantinople and tried before a synod. Their courage was equal to the occasion; nor did they yield when the city-prefect was ordered to scourge them and tear their blasphemous tongues out by the roots and to cut off their right hands. In this mutilated condition they were led through every ward of Constantinople, and then condemned to perpetual exile in Lazica on the eastern coast of the Black Sea. Maximus died there Aug. 13., 662, the monk Anastasius had already passed away on July 24., 662; the apocrisiarius Anastasius lingered on until Oct. 11., 666. In 680, the doctrine of the two wills in Christ, so brutally persecuted in the persons of these martyrs, was formally recognized in the city of Constantinople by the Sixth General Council. — Despite his busy and troubled life, Maximus found time to compose a great many theological works. These writings have always been highly appreciated both in East and West, notwithstanding the fact that their contents and their grandiloquent style make it often difficult to understand the author's meaning. — In the edition of Combefis these works are: a) a long treatise: De variis Scripturae Sacrae quaestionibus ac dubiis ad Thalassium[2], 65 questions and answers concerning difficult scriptural passages. The exegesis is generally allegorical or anagogical. Frequently the biblical text is merely a basis or connective for theologico-mystical considerations. Akin to this work are others: Quaestiones et Responsiones[3], Ad Theopemptum scholasticum[4], Expositio in Psalmum lix[5], Orationis dominicae brevis expositio[6]. The Greek Catenae contain fragments of other exegetical works of Maximus. b) He also wrote commentaries on the writings of the Pseudo-Areopagite, and on several homilies of Gregory of Nazianzus: Scholia in opera S. Dionysii Areopagitae[7], De variis difficilibus locis SS. Dionysii et Gregorii Theologi[8], Ambigua in S. Gregorium Theologum[9]. He esteemed the Areopagitica very highly, and it is largely to his influence that we must trace the interest and the admiration of the Middle Ages for these works; cf. § 100, 2. c) Combefis has collected, under the heading: Opuscula theologica et polemica, a series of polemico-dogmatic treatises[10] most of which are anti-Monophysite or anti-Monothelite. One little treatise[11] deals with the procession of the Holy Ghost. The: Dialogi v de

[1] *Migne*, PG., xc. 135—170; PL., cxxix. 625—656.
[2] Ib., PG., xc. 243—786. [3] Ib., xc. 785—856.
[4] Ib., xc. 1393—1400. [5] Ib., xc. 855—872. [6] Ib., xc. 871—910.
[7] Ib., iv. 15—432, and 527—576, at the end of the Areopagitica.
[8] Ib., xci. 1031—1060. [9] Ib., xci. 1061—1418. [10] Ib., xci. 9—286.
[11] Ib., xci. 133—138.

trinitate[1] were at one time commonly attributed to Maximus; it is now known that they were written before his time (cf. § 78, 8). The treatise: De anima[2], discusses anthropological questions. d) Among his ascetico-moral writings the: Liber asceticus[3] is justly famous; it is a dialogue between an abbot and a young monk on the chief duties of the spiritual life, and is followed by: Capita de caritate, a kind of appendix[4], in which are collected four hundred *sententiae,* mostly of an ethical character. A similar collection is entitled: Capita alia[5]. The contents of two other collections are at once ethical, dogmatic and mystical: Capita theologica et oeconomica 200[6], Diversa capita theologica et oeconomica 500[7]. The most extensive of the collections are his: Capita Theologica, or: Sermones per electa, or: Loci communes[8]: extracts from the Scripture, the Fathers and profane writers, an anthology such as the later Greek, especially monastic, students and writers loved to compile, and to use with much industry and devotion. It must be added that the origin of this particular compilation is still problematical and much disputed. Holl is of opinion that Maximus was really its first compiler, that later on it was reconstructed and enlarged by additions to its original biblical and patristic contents. e) Finally, mention must be made of forty-five letters[9], some of which might well be placed among the theological treatises of Maximus; a: Mystagogia, *μυσταγωγία*[10], or considerations on the symbolico-mystical meaning of the Church and of specific liturgical actions; three Hymns[11]; a Computus ecclesiasticus[12] or instruction for the calculation of ecclesiastical feasts and on chronology (both biblical and profane); a Chronologia succincta vitae Christi (lacking in Migne), really a summary of a larger work. — Maximus is certainly one of the most acute theologians and profound mystics of the Greek Church. In speculative depth and dialectic acuteness he surpasses his master, the Pseudo-Areopagite. There is reason to regret that he did not expound his own ideas systematically and methodically, instead of throwing them out in aphoristic sentences or as supplementary to the text of other writers. The God-Man is always the centre of his dogmatic teachings. The Logos is for him the origin and end of all created beings. The history of the world develops along two great lines: the first is the Incarnation *(σάρκωσις)* of God predestined from the beginning and accomplished historically in the fulness of time; the second is the deification *(θέωσις)* of man that begins with the Incarnation of God and will be finally accomplished through the

[1] *Migne,* PG., xxviii. 1115—1286, among the works of St. Athanasius.
[2] Ib., xci. 353—362. [3] Ib., xc. 911—956.
[4] Ib., xc. 959—1080. [5] Ib., xc. 1401—1462.
[6] Ib., xc. 1083—1176. [7] Ib., xc. 1177—1392.
[8] Ib., xci. 721—1018. [9] Ib., xci. 363—650.
[10] Ib., xci. 657—718. [11] Ib., xci. 1417—1424.
[12] Ib., xix. 1217—1280, among the works of the ecclesiastical historian Eusebius.

restoration of the divine image in man. As the beginning of the new life and the second Adam, Christ is necessarily true God and perfect man. The difference of the natures in Christ does not imply a division of personality, nor does the unity of the latter imply a commingling of the natures. On the contrary, given two whole and perfect natures, there must be also two wills and two natural activities or energies. However, it is only the will in itself, the will as such, that is essential to a perfect nature; that it should act in one way or another *(ἡ γνώμη)*, belongs to the person. «The incarnate Logos possessed, therefore, as man, the will belonging to human nature), but it was directed and guided by His divine will»: *τῷ αὐτοῦ θεϊκῷ θελήματι κινούμενόν τε καὶ τυπούμενον*[1]

A complete edition of the works of St. Maximus was undertaken by *Fr. Combefis*, O. P., Paris, 1675, 2 vols. The third volume was never published; it was to have contained the scholia on the works of the Pseudo-Areopagite. The *Combefis* edition is reprinted in *Migne,* PG., xc to xci, Paris, 1860. The scholia on the Areopagitica may be found in *Migne,* PG., iv, reprinted from the Venice edition of the Areopagite, 1755 to 1756 (cf. § 100, 1). The two other works of St Maximus on the Areopagite and St. Gregory of Nazianzus were for the first time completely edited by *Fr. Oehler,* Anecdota Graeca, Halle, 1857, i, and reprinted in *Migne,* l. c., xci. *Bratke* edited the Chronologia succincta vitae Christi, in Zeitschr. f. Kirchengesch. (1892—1893), xiii. 382—384. On the Scripta S. Maximi inedita vel deperdita see *Fabricius-Harles,* Bibl. Gr., ix. 676—677 (*Migne,* PG., xc. 49—50). In the manuscripts and in the *Combefis* edition several works of Maximus, e. g. De variis scripturae sacrae quaestionibus ac dubiis ad Thalassium, Capita de caritate, and others, are accompanied by brief scholia of unknown provenance. On the Capita theologica (Sermones per electa, Loci communes) see *K. Holl,* in Texte und Untersuchungen (1896), xvi, new series i 1, 342 ff.; cf. ib. (1899), xx, new series v 2, xviii ff., and *A. Ehrhard,* Zu den Sacra Parallela des Johannes Damascenus und dem Florilegium des Maximos, in Byzant. Zeitschrift (1901), x. 394—415. The role of St. Maximus in the Monothelite controversies is described by *Hefele,* Konziliengeschichte, 2. ed., iii. 189 to 247. The doctrine of our Saint is discussed by the following writers: *H. Weser,* S. Maximi Confessoris praecepta de incarnatione Dei et deificatione hominis exponuntur et examinantur (Diss. inaug.), Berlin, 1869; *J. Bach,* Die Dogmengeschichte des Mittelalters vom christologischen Standpunkte, Vienna, 1873, i. 15—49: «Maximus Confessor»; *A. Preuss,* Ad Maximi Confessoris de Deo hominisque deificatione doctrinam adnotationes (Progr.), Schneeberg, 1894, i. *E. Michaud,* St. Maxime le Confesseur et l'apocatastase, in Revue internat. de théol. (1902), pp. 257—272. Cf. *Wagemann,* in *Herzog's* Real-Encyklopädie f. protest. Theol. u. Kirche (1866), Suppl. II, xx. 114—146; 2. ed. (1881), ix. 430—443, an excellent article, with a copious bibliography of the «Confessor». — The two companions in martyrdom of St. Maximus have left each one letter, but extant only in the Latin version. The letter of Anastasius monachus is written to the monks of Calaris, and treats of the two wills in Christ (*Migne,* PG., xc. 133—136; PL., cxxix. 623—626), while that of Anastasius Apocrisiarius is written to Theodosius, a priest of Gangra, and describes the sufferings of the three con-

[1] Ex tract. de operationibus et voluntatibus: *Migne,* PG., xci. 48.

fessors and quotes testimonia of Fathers against the Monotheletism (*Migne,* PG., xc. 173—194). Cardinal *Mai* describes, Script. vet. nova Coll. vii 1, 206 b (*Migne,* PG., lxxxix. 1191—1192), a manuscript-letter of the Apocrisiarius to the monks of Ascalon against Monophysitism and Monotheletism.

4. ANASTASIUS SINAITA. — Anastasius Sinaita is another of those Greek ecclesiastics who displayed a truly apostolic activity amid severe vicissitudes. He was a priest, a monk, and abbot of Mount Sinai monastery, but quitted his solitude to dispute in Egypt and Syria against heretics and Jews. Kumpfmüller has shown (1865) that before his appearance at Alexandria (640) he had already entered the arena against Monophysitism, and that he was still living after 700. If his life is shrouded in much obscurity, equally uncertain are the number and character of his writings. The unedited material is copious, and awaits some scholar to collect all the manuscripts and to sift their contents critically. The best edition is that of *Migne*[1] and contains three large works: A Guide *(ὁδηγός)*[2] or introduction to the defence of Christian truth against the errors of the time, especially the many ramifications of Monophysitism; Questions and answers *(ἐρωτήσεις καὶ ἀποκρίσεις)*[3], concerning one hundred and fifty-four theological points (some of them, however, certainly spurious); Anagogical considerations on the Hexaemeron *(εἰς τὴν πνευματικὴν ἀναγωγὴν τῆς ἑξαημέρου κτίσεως)*[4] in twelve books, the first eleven in a Latin version only. Then follow a discourse on Holy Communion[5]; two on the sixth Psalm[6]; two treatises on the creation of man to the image of God[7], the first of them being only a fragment and attributed to a much earlier author; a fragment of a collection of patristic evidence against heretics[8]. Finally there are some doubtful or spurious works[9] and a few small fragments[10]. Three new works were published by Pitra: a short account of the heresies that had arisen since the time of Christ, with the synods assembled to refute them; a compendious account of the Christian faith; and a treatise on the liturgical character of Wednesday and Friday.

The person and writings of Anastasius are fully described in *J. B. Kumpfmüller,* De Anastasio Sinaita (Diss. inaug.), Würzburg, 1865. Cf. *S. Vailhé,* in Dictionnaire de Théologie, Paris, 1903, i. 1167—1168. Valuable information concerning the manuscripts of our Anastasius and of other writers of the same name is found in the preface (pp. 243—249) of Pitra to the three works of Anastasius, first edited in his Iuris eccl. Graecorum historia et monumenta, Rome, 1868, ii. 257—275. In Ἀνάλεκτα ἱεροσολυμιτικῆς σταχυολογίας, St. Petersburg, 1891, pp. 400—404, *A. Papadopulos-Kerameus* published under the name of the Sinaita a fragment περὶ βλασφημίας. The (154) Questions and Replies were first edited in Greek by *J. Gretser,* S. J.,

[1] PG., lxxxix. [2] Ib., lxxxix. 35—310. [3] Ib, lxxxix. 311—824.
[4] Ib., lxxxix. 851—1078. [5] Ib., lxxxix. 825—850.
[6] Ib, lxxxix. 1077—1144. [7] Ib., lxxxix. 1143—1150 1151—1180.
[8] Ib., lxxxix. 1179—1190. [9] Ib., lxxxix. 1191—1282.
[10] Ib., lxxxix. 1281—1288.

Ingolstadt, 1617. The number of the questions varies in the manuscripts. Four «questions» wanting in the *Gretser* edition, and taken almost entire from the commentary on Daniel by Hippolytus were published from a Munich codex by *H. Achelis,* Hippolytstudien, Leipzig, 1897, pp. 83—88. On the compilation Antiquorum patrum doctrina de Verbi incarnatione cf. § 102, 2, and *D. Serruys,* in Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire (1902), xxii. 157 f., who restores it to Anastasius. Kumpfmüller shows (pp. 147 f.) that for intrinsic reasons the disputes with the Jews (*Migne,* PG., lxxxix. 1203 to 1282) cannot have been written before the ninth century. They make use of the «Dialogue of the Jews Papiscus and Philo with a monk» composed probably in Egypt, about 700, and published by *A. C. McGiffert,* A Dialogue between a Christian and a Jew, entitled: ἀντιβολὴ Παπίσκου καὶ Φίλωνος Ἰουδαίων πρὸς μοναχόν τινα (Diss. inaug.), New York, 1889; cf. *E. J. Goodspeed,* in The American Journal of Theology (1900), iv. 796—802. However, Anastasius himself asserts, in the sixth book of his Hexaemeron (*Migne,* PG., lxxxix. 933; Greek text in *Pitra,* l. c., pp. 244 f.), that he had written treatises against the Jews. *F. Nau,* Les récits inédits du moine Anastase. Contribution à l'histoire du Sinai au commencement du VII. siècle (French version), Paris, 1902, and Le texte grec des récits du moine Anastase sur les saints pères du Sinai, in Oriens Christianus (1902), ii. 58—89: historico-ascetical narratives of our Anastasius about the monks of Mount Sinai. In Revue de l'Orient chrétien (1901), vi. 444—452, *S. Pétrides* attributes to the Sinaita, said to be the sole hymnographer from Mount Sinai, the funeral hymn discovered by *Pitra* at Grottaferrata (§ 105, 2); cf. *D. Serruys,* Anastasiana, in Mélanges, l. c., 157—207. *F Nau,* Le texte grec des récits utiles à l'âme d'Anastase (Sinaita), in Oriens Christianus (1903), pp. 56—90. — According to *Le Quien,* Stephen of Bostra wrote a large work against the Jews, κατὰ Ἰουδαίων, early in the eighth century; some fragments of it, concerning the veneration of the images of the Saints, were made known by *J. M. Mercati,* in Theol. Quartalschr. (1895), lxxvii. 662—668.

5. ST. GERMANUS OF CONSTANTINOPLE. — Germanus was already an aged man when the Iconoclastic conflict broke out at Constantinople (726). He had been made patriarch in 715, but was obliged to quit his see in 730 by order of the Iconoclast emperor Leo the Isaurian. He died in 733 at the age of ninety-eight. The Iconoclast conciliabulum of 754, convoked by the emperor Constantine Copronymus, anathematized his memory. On the other hand, the Seventh Ecumenical Council of Nicæa (787) eulogized not only his holy life and orthodox doctrine, but also the zeal with which he refuted by his writings the false teachings of the heretics[1]. Several of his works seem to have perished. There are extant: De haeresibus et synodis[2], composed shortly after the first edict of the Isaurian against the images, i. e. after 726; a dialogue: De vitae termino[3]; Pro decretis concilii Chalcedonensis epistola Graecorum ad Armenios[4]; Epistolae dogmaticae[5], some of them very important for the history of Icono-

[1] Conc. Nic. II., act. 6; *Mansi,* l. c., xiii. 356—357.
[2] *Migne,* PG., xcviii. 39—88.
[3] Ib., xcviii. 89—132.
[4] Ib., xcviii. 135—146; in Latin only.
[5] Ib., xcviii. 147—222.

clasm; Orationes[1], nine in all, seven of which are on the Blessed Virgin; Rerum ecclesiasticarum contemplatio[2], an exposition of the liturgy, (of very doubtful authenticity); some liturgical hymns[3], and a few minor writings.

For the life of Germanus cf. *Hefele*, Konziliengeschichte, 2. ed., iii. 363 ff. 372 ff. 380 ff.; and for his sermons *A. Ballerini*, Sylloge monumentorum ad mysterium conceptionis Immaculatae Virginis Deiparae illustrandum, Rome, 1854, ii 1, 243—283. Three Idiomela (§ 105, 3; lacking in Migne) are current under the name of Germanus; they were edited by *Christ* and *Paranikas*, Anthologia graeca carminum christianorum, Leipzig, 1871, pp. 98—99; cf. Proleg. xliii. *Photius* describes (Bibl. Cod. 233) a lost work of St. Germanus entitled Ἀνταποδοτικὸς ἢ ἀνόθευτος («retributive or genuine», i. e. genuine retribution). In this work he undertook to prove that Gregory of Nyssa had never taught, as many asserted, the final salvation of all reasonable creatures, even of wicked men and angels; he maintained that the three works of Gregory in which he appeared to defend this doctrine, had been interpolated by heretics, viz. the dialogue: De anima et resurrectione, the greater Catechesis, and the De perfecta vita (?). Cf. § 69, 8. *Cozza-Luzi* maintains that S. Germanus is the author of Historia Mystica Ecclesiae Catholicae. Cf. Nova Patrum Bibl. x. 11, 1—28. One of the earliest Christian apologies against Islam is found in the history of the Armenian Ghevond (eighth century), Tiflis, 1887. It is attributed to Leo the Isaurian, but is probably the work of Germanus.

### § 108. St. John of Damascus.

1. HIS POSITION AND SIGNIFICANCE. — In John of Damascus the ancient Greek Church beheld once more a mighty intellectual leader, one who stood out all the more prominently because of the universal decay into which all contemporary thought was falling. Soon after him, the Schism begins with Photius. John is above all a gatherer of the ecclesiastical wisdom of the past; he considers it his chief duty to construct a large and useful garner in which shall be found all knowledge, doctrinal, ascetical, exegetical and historical. The entire East, it is clear, was conscious that the acme of independent theological production had been reached. It was, therefore, the labors of an encyclopædist that John undertook when he resolved to systematize within fixed limits the formal teachings of the councils and the doctrinal testimony of the illustrious theologians of former times. His great masterpiece of theological learning has been always looked on as a faithful mirror of the traditions of the Greek Church. Moreover, the decrees of the Sixth General Council (680) had rounded out, substantially, the development of dogmatic thought among the Greeks. Henceforth no other master mind arose in the East that could at all compare with the author of the «Fountain of wisdom». This work at once attained a classical reputation

[1] *Migne*, PG., xcviii. 221—384. [2] Ib., xcviii. 383—454.
[3] Ib., xcviii. 453—454.

in all the Oriental churches, and has retained the same to the present day. We have already seen (§ 105, 6) that John was also a distinguished liturgical poet; his hymns eclipsed the compositions even of a Romanos and supplanted them in the liturgical books of the Greeks. To his laurels must also be added the services rendered by him in the last great doctrinal controversy of the Greek Church, i. e. the Iconoclastic conflict. From the safe refuge of the Caliph's court at Damascus he replied to the edicts of Leo the Isaurian, and defended with apostolic energy the cause of the sacred images in writings that continue to attract the admiration of posterity.

2. HIS LIFE. — But little is known of the life of John of Damascus. The oldest *Vita*[1] dates from the tenth century, and exhibits much legendary material. Even the dates of his birth and death are unknown. It seems certain, however, that he belonged to a native Christian family in Damascus, engaged in the civil service of the Caliphs as hereditary administrators of the revenues of Syria. In token of this honorable origin he bore also the Arabic name Mansur, which his enemy Constantine Copronymos (741—775) distorted into Manzeros (*Μάνζηρος*, cf. מַמְזֵר = bastard)[2] Both John and his adopted brother Cosmas were educated by Cosmas, a Sicilian monk (§ 105, 6). It is not known when he entered the service of the Caliph at Damascus, or when he abandoned it. It is probable that he had begun his theological career as early as 726, certainly before 730. After that date, apparently, he retired with his brother Cosmas to the monastery of St. Saba at Jerusalem. John V., patriarch of Jerusalem († 735), conferred priesthood on him; his remaining years were certainly devoted to piety and ecclesiastical learning. He seems to have died also at Jerusalem in the monastery of St. Saba. The Iconoclastic pseudo-Synod of Constantinople (754) anathematized the patriarch Germanus (§ 105, 5), a certain George of Cyprus, and four several times our John under the name of Mansur; all three were evidently no longer among the living, for the acts of the Synod state that the Holy Trinity had removed them: *ἡ τριὰς τοὺς τρεῖς καθεῖλεν*[3]. In 787 the Seventh General Council of Nicæa rehabilitated the outraged memories of these defenders of the faith, and paid the highest tribute to John as a champion of the holy images[4]. Theophanes wrote (813) that in his time John was called Chrysorrhoas (*χρυσορρόας* = gold-outpouring) and rightly «because of that grace of the spirit which shines like gold both in his doctrine and in his life»[5]

3. DOGMATIC WRITINGS. — Among the writings of St. John of Damascus the most famous is his «Fountain of wisdom» (*πηγὴ γνώ-*

[1] Ib., xciv. 429—490. [2] *Theophanes*, Chronogr. ad a. 734.
[3] Conc. Nic. II. act. 6; *Mansi*, l. c., xiii. 356. [4] Ib.; *Mansi*, l. c., xiii. 357.
[5] Chronogr., l. c.

*σεως)*[1], a long work that begins with a philosophical introduction (*κεφάλαια φιλοσοφικά;* the titles of the sections are not the work of our author), usually known as *Dialectica,* but mostly devoted to Aristotelian ontology. A second part is devoted to a succinct history of heresies *(περὶ αἱρέσεων).* As far as the Collyridians (no. 79) he copies the «Panarion» of Epiphanius (§ 71, 2), and similarly other sources for the following period; he is an original writer and witness only in the last chapters (no. 101—103: Islam, Iconoclasm, Aposchitae). In the third and last part he expounds the orthodox Christian faith: *ἔκδοσις ἀκριβὴς τῆς ὀρθοδόξου πίστεως.* In all current editions this part is divided into four books. The first treats of God; the second of creation in general, of angels and demons, of the visible world, of Paradise, of man and his faculties, of divine Providence; the third discusses the Incarnation at length, while the fourth (the least orderly of all) descants on the glory of the God-Man, baptism and the Blessed Eucharist, the veneration of Saints and relics, the canon of the Old and New Testaments, the presence of evil in creation, and the last things. In the Greek manuscripts the third book is not divided into four parts; such a division was first made in the West, and probably in imitation of the four books of the Sentences of Peter Lombard († 1164). Shortly before the composition of the latter's Sentences, Burgundio of Pisa († 1194) had made a barbarous Latin version of the «Fountain of wisdom». Hence it is certain that Peter Lombard borrowed from the Damascene the disposition of the materials of his «Sententiae». The Damascene, in turn, had imitated the outline of Christian doctrine of Theodoret of Cyrus[2]. The third book is chiefly important as a mirror of the theological traditions of the Greek Church. The author frequently observes[3] that his intention is merely to repeat, in a summary and final way, the teachings of former Councils and of the approved Fathers of the Greek Church, particularly St. Gregory of Nazianzus. The «Fountain of wisdom» is dedicated to his brother, Cosmas, bishop of Majuma, and was probably composed in the latter years of the life of John. He was already the author of several dogmatic works: a long profession of faith: *λίβελλος περὶ ὀρθοῦ φρονήματος*[4], written at Damascus, at the request of a bishop Elias, until then probably a Monophysite, and offered by the latter to Peter, the metropolitan of Damascus, as a proof of his orthodoxy; an elementary introduction to the study of Christian doctrine: *εἰσαγωγὴ δογμάτων στοιχειώδης*[5]; it touches slightly on all the questions that are profoundly treated in the first part of the «Fountain of wisdom»; a treatise on the Holy Trinity: *περὶ τῆς ἁγίας τριάδος*[6], by way of questions and

[1] *Migne,* PG., xciv. 517—1228.
[2] Haer. fab. comp. lib. 5; cf. § 60, 4; 78, 5. [3] Prol. and Part I, c. 2.
[4] *Migne,* PG., xciv. 1421—1432. [5] Ib., xcv. 99—112. [6] Ib, xcv. 9—18.

answers, besides the doctrine on Holy Trinity it treats also important points of Christological doctrine; a fuller treatise on the Trisagion: *περὶ τοῦ τρισαγίου ὕμνου*[1], written to an archimandrite, in proof of the assertion that the famous formula: Holy God, Holy Strong (One), Holy Immortal (One), did not refer to the Son alone, but to the whole Trinity. Therefore the addition of Peter Fullo «who wast crucified for us» is inadmissible. Other writings, of doubtful authenticity, are attributed to him: a long profession of faith that has reached us in Arabic only[2]; a letter and a homily usually printed together under the title «Concerning the Body and Blood of our Lord»[3], since both treat of the relation of the Blessed Eucharist to the natural Body of Jesus Christ. — The treatise on those who have died in the faith: *περὶ τῶν ἐν πίστει κεκοιμημένων*[4], in support of the thesis that the faithful departed may be aided by the Holy Mass, prayers, alms, and other good works, and two fragments that reject the use of unleavened bread in the Mass as Judaic and anti-apostolic: *περὶ τῶν ἀζύμων*[5], are without doubt spurious. The treatise on Confession: *περὶ ἐξομολογήσεως*[6], an affirmative answer to the question: Can one confess to monks that are not priests? is the work of Simeon «the new theologian», who flourished about 966—1042.

4. POLEMICAL WORKS. — His polemical writings are also dogmatic in character. The dialogue against the Manichæans: *κατὰ Μανιχαίων διάλογος*[7], is a detailed refutation of the Manichæan dualistic system in the shape of a conference between an orthodox Christian and a follower of Manes; it was probably an attack on the Paulicians, through whom the Manichæans continued to contaminate the East in the latter half of the seventh century. Similar in tone, but less voluminous, is the dispute of the orthodox Christian John with a Manichæan: *διάλεξις Ἰωάννου ὀρθοδόξου πρὸς Μανιχαῖον*[8], first edited by Mai in 1847. The dispute of a Saracen and a Christian: *διάλεξις Σαρακηνοῦ καὶ Χριστιανοῦ*, is mainly devoted to the defence of the Incarnation and the refutation of fatalism; it is extant in two recensions[9]. The fragments on dragons and on witches: *περὶ δρακόντων, περὶ στρυγγῶν*[10], are remnants of an otherwise unknown polemical work directed against the belief in witches, then prevalent among the Jews and the Saracens. The anti-Nestorian and anti-Monophysite arguments of the «Fountain of wisdom» (part III, book 3) are more extensively treated in the works against the heresy of the Nestorians:

[1] Ib., xcv. 21—62.
[2] Latin version from the Arabic, in *Migne*, PG., xcv. 417—436.
[3] Ib., xcv. 401—412. [4] Ib., xcv. 247—278. [5] Ib., xcv. 387—396.
[6] Ib., xcv. 283—304. [7] Ib., xciv. 1505—1584.
[8] Ib., xcvi. 1319—1336.
[9] Ib., xciv. 1585—1598, and xcvi. 1335—1348. [10] Ib., xciv. 1599—1604.

*κατὰ τῆς αἱρέσεως τῶν Νεστοριανῶν*[1], and on the composite nature: *περὶ συνθέτου φύσεως*[2]. At the request of the above-mentioned metropolitan Peter he composed and addressed to a Jacobite bishop: *πρὸς τὸν ἐπίσκοπον δῆθεν Τουδαραίας* (?) *τὸν Ἰακωβίτην*[3], a work that was anti-Monophysite in purpose, but in which he yields to his predilection for positive teaching and expounds the christological doctrine of the Church at great length. Monotheletism was refuted by him in a work on the two wills in Christ: *περὶ τῶν ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ δύο θελημάτων*[4], that manifests a close acquaintance with similar works of Maximus Confessor. The best of his polemical writings are the three apologies in favor of the cultus of images: *πρὸς τοὺς διαβάλλοντας τὰς ἁγίας εἰκόνας*[5]. The first was written probably in 726, on the occasion of the first edict of Leo the Isaurian; the second about 730, and the third some years later. He teaches that every mark of honor paid to the images belongs principally to the object represented by them. He distinguishes clearly between adoration *(λατρεία)* that is properly paid to God alone, and veneration *(προσκύνησις)* that may be offered to creatures. No representation can make known to us the essence of the divinity, but the Incarnate God may be made visible in images of Him: *οὐ τὴν ἀόρατον εἰκονίζω θεότητα, ἀλλ' εἰκονίζω θεοῦ τὴν ὁραθεῖσαν σάρκα*[6]. The Mosaic prohibition of images was meant to prevent any attempt to represent the essence of the divinity; its proper object was to forbid the honoring of images by way of adoration: *ἡ τῆς λατρείας προσκύνησις*. The educational utility of images is evident: they bring home to us the facts of our Redemption, and the virtues of God's Saints; they are the books of all those who cannot read; they act as sermons for those who gaze upon them. These apologies have ever since been praised as among the most useful works ever written on the veneration of images. It need not surprise us to learn that in the mediæval Greek manuscripts many dogmatico-polemical works on the images have been erroneously attributed to our author. In his edition of the Damascene's writings, *Le Quien* accepted two such works: an otherwise noteworthy apology for the images addressed to Constantine Cabalinos or Copronymos[7], and a letter on the cultus of images addressed to emperor Theophilus and written about 846[8]. The continuators of the *Bibliotheca* of Gallandi added to this list a polemical work against the Iconoclasts, composed about 771, and current under the name of John[9].

5. ASCETICAL WRITINGS. — He wrote treatises on the sacred fasts: *περὶ τῶν ἁγίων νηστειῶν*[10], dealing mostly with the duration

[1] *Migne,* PG., xcv. 187—224. [2] Ib., xcv. 111—126.
[3] Ib., xciv. 1435—1502. [4] Ib., xcv. 127—186.
[5] Ib., xciv. 1231—1420. [6] Or. I. 4. [7] *Migne,* PG., xcv. 309—344.
[8] Ib., xcv. 345—386. [9] Ib., xcvi. 1347—1362. [10] Ib., xcv. 63—78.

of the ecclesiastical fasts; on the eight spirits of iniquity: *περὶ τῶν ὀκτὼ τῆς πονηρίας πνευμάτων*[1], or the eight deadly sins, with special reference to the monastic life; on virtues and vices: *περὶ ἀρετῶν καὶ κακιῶν*[2], closely related to the foregoing treatise, but meant for a wider circle of readers. — More ascetic than dogmatic in contents are the *Sacra Parallela,* a collection of biblical and patristic quotations, that easily surpasses in copiousness all similar compilations. It was originally known as *Ἱερά*, and was divided into three books, of which the first dealt with God and divine things, the second with man and human relations, the third with virtues and vices. Each book was, in turn, divided into a long series of «titles» *(τίτλοι)* or rubrics, in the first two books, the key-words or sub-headings were arranged alphabetically, while in the third book a virtue and a vice were regularly opposed to one another; from this latter peculiarity, this book obtained its name *παράλληλα.* The first two books have reached us in their original though somewhat abbreviated form; the entire work was, moreover, variously recast at different times and in such a manner as to do away with the original division into three books, a step that left only the alphabetical arrangement of the materials. The most important of these remodellings are those known as the so-called «Vatican» recension, in the edition of Le Quien[3], and the so-called «Rupefucaldina» from a twelfth- or thirteenth-century manuscript of that collection. Loofs raised doubts (1892) as to the authorship of the Damascene, but Holl has shown convincingly (1896) that the Sacra Parallela were really composed by John of Damascus, although he probably made use of the *Capita theologica* of Maximus Confessor (§ 107, 3).

6. EXEGETICAL AND HISTORICAL WRITINGS. — It is the scriptural learning of the theologians of the past that John undertakes to transmit in his quality of exegete. He wrote a commentary on all the Pauline epistles[4] in which he uses by preference the relevant homilies of Chrysostom, and occasionally draws on Theodoret of Cyrus and Cyril of Alexandria. — He appears as an historian, but only once, in the second part of the «Fountain of wisdom». The «Life of Barlaam and Joasaph: *βίος Βαρλαὰμ καὶ Ἰωάσαφ*[5], in which Robinson has lately discovered the lost Apology of Aristides (§ 15), is not the work of John of Damascus, but of a monk of the same name in the monastery of St. Saba; it was composed probably in the first half of the seventh century. This famous story relates in a lively and picturesque way how the hermit Barlaam converted to Christianity Joasaph, the son of a king of India, in spite of the latter's opposition; also how he afterwards converted the king him-

[1] Ib., xcv. 79—86. [2] Ib. xcv. 85—98.
[3] Ib., xcv. 1039—1588; xcvi. 9—442. [4] Ib., xcv. 441—1034.
[5] Ib., xcvi. 859—1240.

self and his whole kingdom, and finally died as he had lived, a pious hermit. The narrative is sheer romance; Joasaph and Barlaam are not historical figures, and the substance of this work is taken with slight changes from an Indian story about the founder of Buddhism (cf. Prol.). It is to its æsthetic merit and moral contents that this monody on the sublime worth of Christianity and the monastic ideal owed its success as one of the most popular of mediæval folk-tales. Many languages, in East and West, are indebted directly or indirectly, to its Greek text, for the countless prose or poetical versions that have been constructed from it. Another historical Greek text, the life or rather the sufferings of St. Artemius[1], taken mostly from the ecclesiastical history of Philostorgius, was edited by Mai (1840) as a work of John of Damascus; but modern critics reject it as spurious.

7 HOMILIES. — Thirteen homilies are current under his name. Three of them on the «Dormitio» *(εἰς τὴν κοίμησιν)* of the Blessed Virgin, possess a dogmatic interest[2] The orator himself assures us[3] that they were delivered on the feast of the Assumption, and all three on the same day. They present the bodily assumption of the Mother of God into heaven as an ancient heirloom of Catholic faith, and declare[4] that their sole purpose is to develop and establish «what in a brief and almost too concise a manner the son has inherited from the father, according to the common saying». A later hand has interpolated in the second homily (c. 18) the often-quoted but very enigmatical account of the dealings of the empress Pulcheria with Juvenal, patriarch of Jerusalem, in reference to the sepulchre of Mary. Some critics have doubted the authenticity of the two homilies on the birth of Mary[5], and the two homilies on the Annunciation[6], the first extant in Arabic only, belong certainly to a later period. The liturgical poetry of John of Damascus has been described at § 105, 6.

8. LITERATURE. — The first and only complete edition of the works of St. John of Damascus is that by *Mich. Le Quien,* O. P., Paris, 1717, 2 vols.; Venice, 1748, 2 vols. In the Migne reprint (PG., xciv—xcvi, Paris, 1864) there have been added, as a supplement (supplementi vice), several writings that were only gradually recognized as the property of our author. *H. Hayd* translated into German the «Accurate exposition of the orthodox faith» (see no. 3), Kempten, 1880 (Bibl. der Kirchenväter). The spurious work on confession (see no. 3) was edited anew with a commentary by *K. Holl,* Enthusiasmus und Bußgewalt beim griechischen Mönchtum, Leipzig, 1898. For further details concerning the extensive Florilegium described above (no. 5) cf. *Fr. Loofs,* Studien über die dem Johannes von Damaskus zugeschriebenen Parallelen, Halle, 1892; *Th. Schermann,* Die Geschichte der dogmatischen Florilegien vom 5.—8. Iahrhun-

[1] *Migne,* PG, xcvi. 1251—1320. [2] Ib., xcvi. 699—762.
[3] Hom. iii. 5. [4] Hom. ii. 4.
[5] *Migne,* PG., xcvi. 661—698. [6] Ib., xcvi. 643—662.

dert, in Texte und Untersuchungen (1904), xii. 1. *K. Holl,* Die Sacra Parallela des Johannes Damascenus, Leipzig, 1896, in Texte und Untersuchungen, xvi, new series, i. 1; *Id.*, Fragmente vornicänischer Kirchenväter aus den Sacra Parallela, Leipzig, 1899, ib., xx, new series, v. 2; *A. Ehrhard,* Zu den Sacra Parallela und dem Florilegium des Maximos, in Byzant. Zeitschr. (1901), x. 394—415. — The life of Barlaam and Joasaph was edited in Greek by *J. Fr. Boissonade,* Anecdota Graeca, Paris, 1832, iv. 1—365, and again by *S. Kechajoglos,* Athens, 1884. A German version was published by *Fr. Liebrecht,* Münster, 1847. For a more circumstantial account of this work and its literary history see *E. Kuhn,* Barlaam und Joasaph. Eine bibliographisch-literärgeschichtliche Studie, Munich, 1893, in Abhandlungen der k. bayer. Akad. d. Wissensch., I. Klass., vol. xx, sect. i. *Krumbacher,* Gesch. der byzant. Lit., 2. ed., pp. 886—891; cf. *E. Cosquin,* in Revue des quest. hist. (1880), xxxviii. 579—600. On the Vita S. Artemii, edited in Greek by *Mai,* Spicil. Rom., iv. 340—397, cf. *P. Batiffol,* in Röm. Quartalschr. (1889), iii. 252—289. — Among the general writers on John of Damascus are *J. Langen,* Johannes von Damaskus. Eine patristische Monographie, Gotha, 1879. *J. H. Lupton,* St. John of Damascus, London, 1884. For his Christology cf. *J. Bach,* Die Dogmengeschichte des Mittelalters vom christlichen Standpunkt, Vienna, 1873, i. 49—78; K. Ἰ. Δυσβουνιώτης, Ἰωάννης ὁ Δαμασκηνός, Athens, 1903; *K. Bornhäuser,* Die Vergötterungslehre des Athanasius und Johannes Damascenus. Ein Beitrag zur Kritik von *A. Harnacks* Wesen des Christentums, Gütersloh, 1903. — In the Byzant. Zeitschrift (1900), ix. 14—51, *Fr. Diekamp* speaks of a priest or monk George, three of whose short treatises he edits, and whom he considers one of the «sources» for the history of heresies in the second part of the «Fountain of wisdom». The same writer edited, with a commentary, in Theol. Quartalschrift (1901), lxxxiii. 555—599, a manuscript treatise of the Damascene against the Nestorians, also the Greek text of the treatise against the Jacobites that was hitherto known only in a Latin version made from the Arabic (*Migne,* PG., xciv. 1436 f.). *V. Ermoni,* Saint Jean Damascène, in La Pensée chrétienne, Textes et Etudes, Paris, 1904.

## SECOND SECTION.

## ARMENIAN WRITERS.

### § 109. Sketch of the early Armenian ecclesiastical literature.

1. IN GENERAL. — It is very probable that as early as the first century, apostolic missionaries penetrated from Asia Minor into Western Armenia and announced there the good tidings of Christ. The first germs of the new religion were brutally stifled by persecution. Early in the fourth century St. Gregory the Illuminator and his convert king Terdat (Tiridates) won over the whole Armenian plateau to Christianity with incredible rapidity. The Armenian literature, the origin of which goes back to the fourth century. is entirely Christian. Early in the fifth century appear the brilliant names of Isaac the Great and Mesrop. With the aid of Isaac, Mesrop invented (405—406) the Armenian alphabet, and thereby made a native literature possible. In the execution of this task he adapted his letters successfully to

the phonetics of the Armenian tongue, one of the Indo-Germanic languages and closely related to Persian. The first book written in the new alphabet was the Bible; it was translated about 410 by Isaac and Mesrop, with the help of other learned men, from the Syriac Peschittho. About 432 this text was revised and definitively established according to the Hexaplar Septuagint and the Greek text of the New Testament. From this version of the Bible sprang the abundant literature of Armenia, that includes many theological and historical works, also translations from Greek and Syriac. It was not long, however, in reaching its acme. While Isaac the Great still lived, Armenia was stripped of her political independence, never again to regain it. In the following century the anti-Christian administration of her Persian conquerors struck a severe blow at the organization and life of the Christian Church in Armenia; finally when it had withstood the stress of persecution and emerged therefrom victorious, the Armenian Church fell a victim to the Monophysite heresy. Long before this, however, Armenia had sunk into intellectual lethargy and sterility.

The first attempt at a history of Armenian literature is owing to *Pl. Sukias Somal,* Quadro delle opere di vari autori anticamente tradotte in Armeno, Venice, 1825, and: Quadro della Storia letteraria di Armenia, Venice, 1829. It is on these works that *C. Fr. Neumann* based his Versuch einer Geschichte der armenischen Literatur, nach den Werken der Mechitaristen frei bearbeitet, Leipzig, 1836. Cf. *C. Fr. Neumann,* Beyträge zur armenischen Litteratur, fasc. I (the only one), Munich, 1849. Among the later works on the history of Armenian literature are those of *P Karekin,* History of Armenian literature, Venice, 1865—1878, 2 vols., 2. ed. 1886, 3. ed. 1897 (in modern Armenian). *F. Nève,* L'Arménie chrétienne et sa littérature, Louvain, 1886 (not a comprehensive history of Armenian literature, but a series of special studies, the most important of which [pp. 46—247] is that on Armenian hymnology). There is a good conspectus of Armenian literature in *v. Himpel's* article «Armenische Sprache, Schrift und Literatur», in the Lexikon of Wetzer und Welte (1882), 2. ed., i. 1344—1353; cf. *P. Karekin,* Armenian Biography, Venice, 1883 (in modern Armenian), and *Id.,* Catalogo delle antiche versioni armene, Venice, 1889. For «Mesrop and his school» see *P Vetter,* in *J. Nirschl,* Lehrbuch der Patrologie und Patristik (1885), iii. 215—262. The early Christian history of Armenia is found in the critical work of *S. Weber,* Die katholische Kirche in Armenien, ihre Begründung und Entwicklung. Ein Beitrag zur christlichen und Kulturgeschichte, Freiburg, 1893. See *L. Petit,* Arménie. Littérature, in Dict. de la Théologie, i. 1933 to 1944. The Armenian version of the scriptures is described in the special introductions to the Bible. — During the eighteenth century many ancient works in Armenian were printed at Constantinople and London. In the nineteenth century the Mechitarist Congregation of San Lazzaro at Venice has earned lasting renown by its editions of several classical works of Armenian literature.

2. ST. GREGORY ILLUMINATOR AND AGATHANGELOS. — Gregory was the apostle and the first bishop of Armenia; he closed his long, laborious and stormy life about 332. The Armenian Church con-

tinues to hold in great honor a collection of (23) discourses and encyclical letters of Gregory Vetter is of opinion that these documents belong to the first half of the fifth century, and that they are probably writings of Mesrop. — There is extant under the name of Agathangelos, whom the Armenians regard as their first national historiographer, a history of Gregory Illuminator and his apostolic labors as first missionary to the Armenians. The work exists in Armenian and in Greek. The Armenian text is entitled: History of the Great Terdat (Tiridates) and of the preaching of St. Gregory the Illuminator, while the Greek text has «Martyrdom of St. Gregory». The latter work is clearly a version from the Armenian: in the Armenian work there is a long doctrinal discourse of Gregory, equal to one half of the whole work; the Greek translator has suppressed this document. The author calls himself Agathangelos and says he wrote at the order of king Terdat, not from ancient legends, but as one who had seen and heard what he narrated. On the other hand, v. Gutschmid has shown that the original Armenian text of Agathangelos belongs to the middle of the fifth century and that it includes fragments of two earlier works: a biography of St. Gregory, and a martyrdom of St. Gregory and of St. Rhipsime and her companions. One can find in Agathangelos reliable historical material, but he also offers much that is legendary and incredible. The unknown author seems to have called himself Agathangelos *(ἀγαθάγγελος)*, merely because he related to the Armenians the «good tidings» of the introduction of Christianity among them.

The collection of pseudo-homilies of the Illuminator was printed in Armenian at Constantinople in 1737, and at Venice, 1838. We owe a German version of the work to *J. M. Schmid,* Reden und Lehren des hl. Gregorius des Erleuchters, Patriarch von Armenien, Ratisbon, 1872. Some of the most remarkable passages are also translated into German by *Vetter,* l. c. (see no. 1), pp. 223—227; he also discusses (l. c., pp. 219 to 222) the origin of the homilies. *Nève* (l. c., see no. 1), pp. 250 ff., considers them genuine. — The Armenian text of Agathangelos was published at Constantinople 1709 and 1824; at Venice 1835 and 1862; at Tiflis 1882. An Italian version, minus the long discourse of Gregory, was published at Venice, 1843. There is a French version of the work, without the purely devotional sections, in *V. Langlois,* Collection des historiens anciens et modernes de l'Arménie, Paris, 1867, i. 97—193. The Greek text of Agathangelos was edited from a Florentine manuscript by *J. Stilting,* in Acta SS. Sept., Antwerp, 1762, viii. 320—402. *Stilting's* edition is reprinted in *Langlois* (l. c.), and again in *P. de Lagarde,* Agathangelus und die Akten Gregors von Armenien (Abhandlungen der kgl. Gesellsch. der Wissensch. zu Göttingen, Göttingen, 1887, xxxv. *A. v. Gutschmid,* Agathangelos, in Zeitschr. der deutschen Morgenländ. Gesellsch. (1877), xxxi. 1—60. *G. Thoumaian,* Agathangelos et la doctrine de l'église arménienne au V^e^ siècle (Thèse), Lausanne, 1879. *B. Sargisean,* Agatangelo ed il suo mistero polisecolare (literary Armenian), Venice, 1890.

3. ISAAC THE GREAT AND MESROP. — Isaac (in Armenian «Sahak») surnamed the Great, was Catholicos or patriarch of Armenia during

the years 390—440, and rendered incalculable services to the youthful church of that country in a period of grave peril and oppression. His prudence and zeal thwarted the attempts of the Persian kings to introduce the worship of Ormuzd; on the other hand, he withstood the solicitations of the Nestorians, and caused the Armenian nation to rally to the defence of the decrees of Ephesus. He was supported by Mesrop, who shared his labors and his ideas, and contributed greatly to the development of ecclesiastical life and the extinction of paganism and heresy. After the death of Isaac (440), Mesrop bore the burden of episcopal administration until the nomination of a new Catholicos. He did not long survive his lifelong friend, his death took place some six months later, in 441. We have already mentioned the debt owed by the nation to these two great men for their invention of an Armenian alphabet and their labors in translating the Scriptures into Armenian. They are also, in a large measure, the creators of the Armenian liturgy. In the annals of Armenian literature both are credited with ecclesiastical hymns; Isaac in particular is said to have written a manual of liturgy. Mesrop seems to have translated into Armenian several works of Greek and Syriac ecclesiastical writers; in the absence of exact information, it is not easy to say how much belongs to Mesrop amid the abundant Armenian ecclesiastical translation-literature of the fifth century. It has been stated above that, according to Vetter, Mesrop is the author of the homilies attributed to Gregory Illuminator.

On the literary history of Isaac the Great cf. *Neumann,* Versuch einer Geschichte der armen. Literatur (see no. 1), pp. 28—30. Moses of Corene has incorporated in his History of Armenia Major (iii. 57; see no. 6) three short letters of Isaac; one each to the emperor Theodosius II., Atticus patriarch of Constantinople, and the prefect Anatolius. There is a German version of these letters in *M. Lauer,* Des Moses von Chorene Geschichte Groß-Armeniens, Ratisbon, 1869, pp. 219—220. In the American Journal of Theology (1898), ii. 828—848, *Fr. C. Conybeare* translated into English an ecclesiastical ordinance of Isaac. For two other letters, written conjointly by Isaac and Mesrop, in reply to Proclus of Constantinople and Acacius of Melitene, see «The Book of Letters» edited by *J. Ismireanz,* Tiflis, 1901; in this work are also found many other letters and documents of the ancient Armenian literature not mentioned here. — The apostolic labors of St. Mesrop are described with feeling and with classic elegance in a life written by his disciple Koriun, a bishop in Georgia, between 445 and 451. It was edited at Venice in 1833, and translated into German (without the diffuse introduction) by *B. Welte,* Goriuns Lebensbeschreibung des hl. Mesrop, Tübingen, 1841. Another shorter and later recension of the biography was printed at Venice in 1854 and 1895, and translated into French by *J. R. Emin,* in the collection of *Langlois* (see no. 2), l. c., ii. 1—16. On the invention of the Armenian alphabet cf. Mesrob e l' alfabeto armeno, in Bessarione (1896 1897), i. 807—810 912 to 917 — For Chosrowig, one of the fifth-century translators of the Bible into Armenian, see *J. Dashian,* Short bibliographical Studies, Researches and Texts (modern Armenian), Vienna, 1895, i. 49—75. The work ends

with a little treatise entitled. «From Chosrowik, the Armenian translator, to those who say that together with His spiritual and eternal nature God the Word received from the Virgin human nature.» — There are also extant some writings of Ananias, another of these early translators, a homily on the mystery of the prophet Jonas, and a sermon on St. John the Baptist. Ananias is also the reputed translator into Armenian of the works of Philo of Alexandria; cf. *B. Sargisean,* Ananias the Translator, Venice, 1899 (modern Armenian). There is an account of the disciples of Isaac and Mesrop, and of the earliest Armenian translators of the fifth century in the work of Misadgean, Vienna, 1902.

4. EZNIK. — This disciple of Mesrop was born in the village of Kolb (Koghb) and is certainly identical with Eznik, bishop of Bagrevand, who assisted at the synod of Aschtischat, in 449. His high place in Armenian literature is owing to his work in four books, entitled: «The Confutation of the sects». In the first book he refutes the «sect of the pagans», and chiefly their doctrines of the eternity of matter, and of evil as something substantial, not accidental. In the second book he challenges the «religion of the Persians», particularly Zerwanitism, a later form of Parseism. In the third book he turns his weapons against «the schools of the Greek philosophers», and particularly their astronomical notions and teaching. In the fourth he deals with «the sect of Marcion», and its pretended possession of a traditional secret doctrine. Vetter says that the whole is «the first essay of a highly gifted nation which has just risen from barbarian ignorance to Christian thinking, in order to fight against the pagan view of life in its principal systems and in its chief ideas, in a speculative manner. «Eznik displays much acumen and extensive erudition. His writings are said to offer the most perfect example of the ancient classic Armenian. Native tradition attributes some homilies to him, but they have perished. He was also a collaborator in the translation of the Bible (see no. 1), and perhaps of other works from Greek and Syriac.

The Armenian text of the «Confutation of the sects» was printed at Smyrna, in 1762, and at Venice, in 1826 and 1863; these editions contain also a short collection of Sententiae (93) attributed to Eznik. A (very defective) French version of the Confutation and of this collection was published by *Le Vaillant de Florival,* Réfutation des différentes sectes etc., Paris, 1853. We owe a good German version to *J. M. Schmid,* Eznik von Kolb, Wider die Sekten, Leipzig, 1900 (Bibliothek der alten armen. Literatur, i). The date of the composition and genuineness of Eznik's chief work is discussed by *S. Weber,* in Theol. Quartalschr. (1897), lxxix. 367—398; the contents of the Confutation is also described by *Weber,* in Katholik (1898), i. 212—231 311—326. As to its «sources» see *Vetter,* Theol. Quartalschr. (1894), lxxvi. 529 ff.; Lit. Rundschau (1895), p. 269. — David the Armenian, who lived in the second half of the fifth century and translated Aristotelian and Neoplatonist works, belongs to the history of philosophy; he was, nevertheless, a champion of the orthodox faith against the Nestorians. Cf. *v. Himpel* on David, in Wetzer und Welte, Kirchenlexikon, 2. ed., iii. 1411—1413.

5. ST. ELISCHE. — More numerous works have reached us under the name of St. Elische (Elisaeus). He, too, was a disciple of Mesrop, and in his youth had served under the Armenian general Vardanes either as soldier or secretary. He is usually identified with Elische, bishop of the Amatunii, one of the members of the national council of Aschtischat (449). He died, as anchorite, about 480. The Mechitarist edition of his works contains commentaries on Joshua and Judges, an explanation of the Our Father, a beautiful letter to the Armenian monks, rules for the treatment of demoniacs, and many homilies notably on events in the life of Christ, and a history of Vardanes and the Armenian War. The genuineness or integrity of all these writings has been called in question. The story of the brave struggle for their Christian faith carried on by the Armenians under Vardanes (449—451) against the tyranny and persecution of the powerful Persian king, Jezdegerdes II., was always a favorite work among the Armenians. Vetter says of it: «The history of Vardanes is based on the accounts of eye-witnesses. It is one of the noblest works of Armenian historiography, whether we consider the grandiose and dramatic disposition of the material, the severe and dignified style, or the warm enthusiasm of the writer for Church and fatherland.»

Complete editions of the works of Elische were printed at Venice, 1839 and 1859. The history of Vardanes was printed several times: Constantinople 1764; Tiflis 1879; Venice 1893. It has been translated into several European languages: into English by *C. Fr. Neumann,* London, 1830 (unfinished); into Italian by *G. Cappelletti,* Venice, 1840; into French by *G. Kabaradji,* Paris, 1844 (untrustworthy), and by *Langlois,* in his Collection des historiens de l'Arménie, ii. 177—251. Cf. *Vetter,* l. c., p. 262, and *Nève,* l. c., pp. 299—316. In his dissertation Dei tesori patristici e biblici conservati nella letteratura armena (Compte-rendu du IV congrès scientif. internat. des Catholiques, Fribourg [Suisse], 1898, pp. 209—230), *B. Sargisean* remarks (pp. 221—222) that in the Vardanes-commentary on Genesis (saec. XIII) there has been preserved a considerable portion of a commentary of Elische on the same book; Sargisean thinks that Elische's commentary on Joshua and Judges is a translation of some Alexandrine commentary. — Lazarus of Pharp, a younger contemporary of Elische, wrote a history of Armenia from 388 to 485. It was printed in Venice in 1793 1807 1873 1891, and translated into French by *S. Ghesarian,* in *Langlois* (l. c., ii. 253—368). — *John Mandakuni* († about 498, as Catholicos of Armenia) is the reputed author of a number of homilies edited at Venice in 1837 and 1860, and translated into German by *J. M. Schmid,* Ratisbon, 1871. Cf. *B. Sargisean,* Critical Researches on John Mandakuni and his Works, Venice, 1895 (in modern Armenian). He is also credited with a treatise as to whether the Redeemer is spoken of as in two natures or in one only. It is found in the «Book of Letters» (§ 109, 3).

6. MOSES OF CHORENE. — The most celebrated of the ancient Armenian writers is Moses of Choren (Chorene), surnamed the «father of Scholars». Three large works are attributed to him: a History of Armenia Major, a Geography, and a Rhetoric, also some smaller

works, e. g. the life of Saint Rhipsime and her companions, a correspondence with the Artsrunic prince Isaac (Sahak), some homilies, and numerous ecclesiastical hymns. The most important of these writings is the History of Armenia Major. It is divided into three sections: «a Genealogy of Armenia Major» or its history from the most ancient times to the foundation of the Arsacid dynasty (149 B. C.), «a History of the middle period of our ancestors», i. e. the story of the Armenian Arsacids to the death of St. Gregory Illuminator and king Terdat, finally «the End of the history of our fatherland», in which he relates the events that happened between the death of Terdat and the extinction of the Armenian Arsacids (428). In mediæval times there was extant a fourth book that brought the history down to the emperor Zeno (474—491); this book is lacking in all known manuscripts. The highly pathetic style of the work is closely imitated in the fifth-century Armenian version of the so-called «Book of Alexander», i. e. biography of Alexander by pseudo-Callisthenes. The author of the history of Armenia Major calls himself Moses of Chorene and pretends to belong to the fifth century, to be a disciple of Saint Mesrop, and to have composed his work at the request of Isaac (Sahak), the Bagratunic prince who fell in battle in 482. These personal statements are shown to be untrustworthy, for internal and external reasons. In his account of his own life the author contradicts such fifth-century writers as Koriun and Lazarus of Pharp. Carrière has shown recently that he makes use of historical sources posterior to the sixth and even the seventh century, e. g. Armenian versions of the *Vita S. Silvestri* and the Church history of Socrates. It is only since the ninth century that traces of his work are found in Armenian literature. This does not carry with it the negation of the historical personality of Moses of Chorene, who is one of the venerable fathers of the Armenian Church, and who really lived in the fifth century. Lazarus of Pharp bears witness to the existence in the fifth century of an Armenian bishop who was named Moses and was a distinguished writer. We do not know the reason why this eighth- or ninth-century writer took the name and the mask of Moses of Chorene. He makes it clear that he intends to glorify the Bagratunid dynasty. From the end of the seventh century this dynasty surpassed in splendor all the other noble houses of Armenia; in 885 Aschot I., a descendant of that house, was recognized by the Caliph as king of Armenia. Vetter conjectures that the secret aim of the pseudo-Moses of Chorene was to prepare the way for the accession of this house. In spite of its really late date, the author's narrative is, generally speaking, trustworthy. He draws largely on ancient authorities, though occasionally he modifies them in a capricious way and embodies his own ideas in their context; but it cannot be maintained,

as some have done, that he invented these authorities off-hand. His witnesses for the ancient history of Armenia, even as late as the second or third century after Christ, were principally legends and folk-song, and it is precisely this legendary element that lends to the work its special charm and value. The Geography and Rhetoric mentioned above are of course no more genuine works of Moses of Chorene, than the History. All three works are by the same author, as is evident both from the testimony of the manuscripts and from intrinsic criteria. The author's own statement leads us to believe that the Geography is an extract from the description of the world (*χωρογραφία οἰκουμενική*) by Pappus, an Alexandrine author of the fourth century of our era. The Rhetoric is entitled «Chria» in the manuscripts, and is executed on such Greek models as Aphthonius and Theon. The minor writings mentioned above await a more thorough examination into their genuineness. Vetter has shown that the correspondence with Prince Isaac concerning the origin of a miraculous Madonna cannot be earlier than the year 1000.

Complete editions of our author's works were printed at Venice in 1843 and 1865. The History of Armenia Major has been republished, in the original and in versions, more frequently than any other work of Armenian literature. The first edition appeared at Amsterdam in 1695, the last at Venice in 1881 (Tiflis, 1881). For a critical history of all editions cf. *A. Baumgartner,* in Zeitschr. der Deutschen morgenländischen Gesellsch. (1886), xl. 482—489. There is a new French version in *Langlois,* Collection des historiens, ii. 45—175. A German version is owing to *M. Lauer,* Ratisbon, 1869; and an Italian one to *G. Cappelletti,* Venice, 1841. *A. v. Gutschmid,* Über die Glaubwürdigkeit der armenischen Geschichte des Moses von Khoren, in Berichte über die Verhandlungen der kgl. sächs. Gesellsch. der Wissensch., philol.-hist. Klasse (1876), xxviii. 1 to 43. *A. Carrière,* Moïse de Khoren et les généalogies patriarcales, Paris, 1891. *Id.,* Nouvelles sources de Moïse de Khoren, Vienna, 1893, with a supplement, Vienna, 1894. *Id.,* La légende d'Abgar dans l'histoire d'Arménie de Moïse de Khoren, Paris, 1895. *Id.,* Les huits sanctuaires de l'Arménie païenne d'après Agathange et Moïse de Khoren, Paris, 1899. *Fr. C. Conybeare* dissents, in Byzant. Zeitschr. (1901), x. 489—504, from *Carrière's* conclusions concerning the late date of Moses of Chorene. The legends and sagas of Armenia that Moses wove into his History are illustrated by *Vetter,* in Theol. Quartalschr. (1894), lxxvi. 48—76. *Vetter* enumerates, in the Kirchenlexikon of Wetzer und Welte, 2. ed., viii. 1961, the editions and versions of the Geography. There is also an edition with a Russian version and notes by *K. P. Patkanov,* St. Petersburg, 1877. *J. Marquart,* Evanschahr nach der Geographie des Pseudo-Moses Chorenazi. Mit historisch-kritischem Kommentar und historischem und topographischem Exkurse, Berlin, 1901 (Abhandlungen der kgl. Gesellsch. der Wissensch. zu Göttingen). The work on Rhetoric is described by *A. Baumgartner,* in Zeitschr. der Deutschen morgenländ. Gesellsch. (1886), xl. 457 to 515. For the correspondence with Prince Isaac see *Vetter,* in *Nirschl,* Patrologie, iii. 244—246. Cf. also *v. Gutschmid* on Moses of Chorene, in Encyclopedia Britannica, 9. ed., xvi. 861—863, and *Vetter,* in Kirchenlexikon, viii. 1955—1963.

THIRD SECTION.

# LATIN WRITERS.

## § 110. General conspectus.

1. DECADENCE OF ECCLESIASTICAL LITERATURE. — The decay of scientific thought and endeavor that characterizes the Greek East in this period (cf. § 98, 1), is visible also in the Latin West. Both creative power and energetic will have become weak. The best efforts of ecclesiastical scholars are now directed towards the co-ordination and practical use of the materials bequeathed by earlier scholarship. It is the period in which Roman civilization suffers complete wreckage at the hands of the irresistible Northern and Eastern tribes; barbarism with all its accompanying horrors hangs like a dark cloud over the entire West. But the untutored conquerors are amenable to spiritual ideas and influences; gradually they begin to look on the Church with sentiments of joy and gratitude as on their mistress and teacher. From its contact with the Germanic nations ecclesiastical science acquired new objects, signs of literary activity began again to multiply (see no. 2). The quasi-total theological decadence visible in the East since the fifth century, was never quite so complete in the West; Latin theology continues to offer a series of remarkable names. Christian literature really flourished at the end of the fifth century in Southern Gaul, while in the sixth century theological science got new life in Northern Africa, Italy and Spain.

2. SUBJECT-MATTER OF LATIN THEOLOGY. — Foremost among the polemico-dogmatic discussions are the questions concerning the relations of free-will and divine grace. While the Greeks loved to discuss the problems of Christology (§ 84, 1), the Latin theologians had long since manifested their preference for Christian anthropology and the doctrine of grace. Pelagianism had been overthrown, but Semipelagianism continued to find valiant defenders, especially in its native home of Southern Gaul, until it was definitively condemned (529) in the second Council of Orange, owing to the influence of Cæsarius of Arles. Nor were the Christological questions forgotten by Latin writers of this period; they found investigators in almost all parts of the West. The Germanic tribes that had overflowed to the South and the West were all originally Arian, and their conversion necessitated the study and discussion of the ecclesiastical teaching concerning Jesus Christ. Chosen instruments of divine Providence devoted their lives and their learning to the re-union of these misguided peoples with the Church. In Southern Gaul, Faustus of Reji was the apostle of the Visigoths, while Avitus of Vienne was that of Burgundy. In Africa, Vigilius of Tapsus and Fulgentius of Ruspe entered the lists against Arianism, though all their efforts were made

fruitless by the cruel tyranny of the Vandal princes. Martin of Bracara begins the conversion of the Suabian tribes in Spain, while Leander of Seville prepares the way for the return of the Visigoths of Spain to the unity of Catholicism. In this period the theological science of the West was wisely mindful of the future. Boethius and Cassiodorius devoted themselves unceasingly to preserving for later ages the substance of contemporary classical culture. Similarly, the writings of Isidore of Seville, the greatest polyhistor of his time, were particularly helpful in familiarizing the Germanic peoples with Roman science; they made it possible to create again a civilized existence in the midst of surrounding barbarism.

3. AWAKENING OF THE THEOLOGICAL SCIENCES. — The circumstances of the time did not call for apologetical treatises. Salvianus of Marseilles defended divine Providence against the objections of many who were scandalized by the horrors of the age. Fulgentius of Ruspe, the most capable dogmatic theologian of the sixth century, an opponent of Arianism and a defender of the teaching of St. Augustine on grace, wrote a useful compendium of dogmatic theology. Most of the contemporary theological writings were polemical in character. Faustus of Reji wrote in favor of Semipelagianism and against the predestinationism of the priest Lucidus. Other Semipelagian writers were Arnobius Junior, Gennadius of Marseilles, and the unknown author of the *Praedestinatus*. Foremost in the conflict with Semipelagianism stands Fulgentius of Ruspe. Arianism, Macedonianism, Nestorianism, and Eutychianism found opponents among the Latin theologians and among them such men as Faustus of Reji, Gennadius of Marseilles, Avitus of Vienne in Gaul, Vigilius of Tapsus, Pope Gelasius and Boethius in Italy, Leander of Seville in Spain. The first edict of Justinian against the Three Chapters aroused long and heated discussions, particularly in Italy and Africa. In the latter province these controversies drew into the arena Fulgentius Ferrandus, Facundus of Hermiane, Verecundus of Junca, Liberatus of Carthage, and others, while in Italy Pelagius, archdeacon and pope, the deacon Rusticus, and others, figured prominently. In exegesis the allegorico-mystical interpretation attained sole supremacy Arnobius Junior wrote commentaries on the Psalms, Primasius of Adrumetum on the Apocalypse, Cassiodorius on the Psalms and several books of the New Testament, Justus of Urgel on the Canticle of canticles, Gregory the Great on the Book of Job. Junilius composed an introduction to the Scripture that was executed quite in the spirit of Theodore of Mopsuestia. Cassiodorius wrote a methodology of theological studies in which he assigned the central position to biblical science. The exegetical labors of Victor of Capua have perished; on the contrary many treatises of Isidore of Seville have survived, they deal with the history, archæology and exegesis of the Bible. In history

the chroniclers make their appearance; each one continues his predecessor as far as his own time. Among them are Hydatius, Marcellinus Comes, Cassiodorius, Victor of Tunnuna, John of Biclaro, Marius of Avenches. In his *Historia tripartita* Cassiodorius prepared a manual of Church history for the mediæval world. Valuable special histories were written in this period. Thus, Cassiodorius wrote a history of the Goths that has reached us only in extracts, while Gregory of Tours wrote an ecclesiastical history of the Franks. Less useful is the history or chronicle of the Spanish Visigoths that we owe to Isidore of Seville. The modest *Vita S. Severini* of the abbot Fugippius throws light on the history of barbarian Germany Victor Vitensis wrote a history of the persecutions of African Catholics by their Vandal masters. The history of heresy owes something to the works of the author of *Praedestinatus* and to Liberatus of Carthage. In turn, the history of theological literature is indebted to Gennadius of Marseilles and Isidore of Seville. Gregory of Tours and Venantius Fortunatus wrote hagiological works. Ecclesiastical chronology was cultivated and advanced by Dionysius Exiguus. Practical theology is represented by Salvianus of Marseilles, Julianus Pomerius, Martin of Bracara, Gregory the Great. In this field the latter is easily foremost; his *Regula pastoralis* is a manual of didactic theology that manifests on every page a profound knowledge of man and abounds in practical wisdom. His *Dialogi* met also with universal approval; they are narratives filled with the miracles of holy men and were intended to serve as spiritual reading for Christians. Canon Law owes to Dionysius Exiguus a collection of the ecclesiastical canons (the: Dionysiana); he inserted in it not only the synodal decrees, but also many decretal letters of the popes in their historical order. Similarly, his younger contemporaries Fulgentius Ferrandus, Cresconius, and Martin of Bracara, made systematic collections of ancient canonical materials and enlarged them. Monastic rules were drawn up by Benedict of Nursia, Cæsarius of Arles, Aurelianus of Arles, Leander of Seville, Isidore of Seville. Among them the Rule of St. Benedict alone survived and spread so widely that he became the acknowledged patriach of all the monks of the West. Gregory of Tours left some works of a liturgical character. Faustus of Reji and Cæsarius of Arles are known as authors of homilies. The latter was hailed by his contemporaries as the greatest popular orator of the ancient Latin Church. In poetry there are some shining names: Apollinaris Sidonius, Ennodius of Pavia, Venantius Fortunatus, though the first two can scarcely be called ecclesiastical poets. Epic poetry was cultivated by Paulinus of Pella and Paulinus of Petricordia. More important are the didactico-lyrical effusions of the African writer Dracontius, and the long didactico-epic poem of Avitus of Vienne. In some of his hymns Venantius Fortunatus surpassed himself.

### § 111. Faustus of Reji.

1. HIS LIFE. — This writer whom John Cassian (§ 96, 1) calls the most active champion of Semipelagianism in its primitive form, was born in Britain early in the fifth century. He was still a young man when he devoted himself to the service of God in the famous monastery of Lérins (§ 96, 2). In 433 he succeeded the abbot Maximus on the occasion of the latter's elevation to the see of Reji (now Riez in Provence), where he was also (452) the successor of Maximus. His literary labors belong to this period of his life. About 478 he was exiled by the Visigothic king, Eurich, for the zeal with which he opposed the Arian heresy in the latter's kingdom; at the death of the king (485), however, he was allowed to return to his see. His subsequent history is unknown to us. Faustus was one of the most influential and authoritative bishops of Southern Gaul between 450 and 500. About 480 Gennadius of Marseilles wrote of him:[1] viva voce egregius doctor et creditur et probatur. He had a reputation for eminent sanctity, and amid contemporary controversies was honored by all as an oracle of theological wisdom. Nevertheless his anthropological principles were vigorously opposed by several of his contemporaries, and much more so by theologians of the next generation.

2. HIS WORKS. — Gennadius[2] places first among the writings of the bishop of Reji his: (liber) De Spiritu Sancto, in quo ostendit eum iuxta fidem patrum et consubstantialem et coaeternalem esse Patri et Filio ac plenitudinem Trinitatis obtinentem. This work has reached us, but in most manuscripts is erroneously attributed to the Roman deacon Paschasius, who died about 500 and was really the author of a (lost) treatise: De Spiritu Sancto. Until very lately all editions of the work attributed it to Paschasius[3]. Engelbrecht was the first to show (1891) that it belongs to Faustus of Reji. Very similar in contents is another work mentioned by Gennadius as the third of our author's writings: Adversus Arianos et Macedonianos parvus libellus, in quo coessentialem praedicat Trinitatem. The identity of this work is disputed. Engelbrecht recognizes it in the *De ratione fidei* (lacking in Migne) edited by Sichard in 1528 and by him attributed to Faustus of Reji. Rehling identifies it with the first part of a separately circulated letter written by Faustus to an unknown person, whom, however, he addresses as: reverendissime sacerdotum[4]. Gennadius places second among the writings of Faustus an: opus egregium de gratia Dei qua salvamur. It is the: De gratia libri duo[5], a refutation of the predestinationism of Lucidus, a Gallic priest, among whose teachings those concerning the total extinction

[1] De viris ill., c. 85. [2] L. c. [3] Cf. *Migne,* PL., lxii. 9—40.
[4] Ib., lviii. 837—845. [5] Ib., lviii. 783—836.

of free will as the result of original sin, the limited extent of the grace of redemption, and predestination to eternal damnation, were condemned at the synods of Arles (about 473) and Lyons (about 474). It was in reply to the request of the Fathers of these councils, particularly of the archbishop Leontius of Arles, for a theological refutation of Lucidus, that Faustus composed this work. Here as elsewhere he is a vigorous opponent both of Pelagianism and of Predestinationism; his standpoint is the Semipelagianism of John Cassian. He vehemently denies the necessity of a *gratia praeveniens* in the sense of Augustine. In an earlier letter to Lucidus[1] he admits a *gratia praecedens,* but he understands thereby only the external grace of revelation. He writes with some indignation against the concept of a *gratia specialis et personalis,* as it is presented in the Augustinian theory of predestination. Positive opposition to the views of Faustus was not slow in manifesting itself (§ 102, 2). The little treatise that is next mentioned by Gennadius: (libellus) Adversus eos qui dicunt esse in creaturis aliquid incorporeum, is certainly identical with the letter *ad reverendissimum sacerdotum,* or with its second part, that was possibly current as a separate treatise. In it Faustus maintains a certain corporeity of the human soul, even of angels, as an inevitable result of their existence in space. To refute these views Claudius Mamertus composed his work: De statu animae. Gennadius mentions two other letters of Faustus, one of a dogmatico-polemical character to Graecus, a Nestorian deacon (written at Lérins before 452), and the other an exhortatory and ascetic missive to Felix, patricius and praefectus praetorii (written during his exile and before 480). In all, ten letters of Faustus have reached us, five of which are addressed to Ruricius, bishop of Limoges. Gennadius knew the titles of other works (scripta) of Faustus, but he did not mention them because he had not yet read them. It is very probable that he speaks of such minor writings as letters and sermons. Faustus certainly composed many sermons, but they have reached us in anonymous form or under other names. One reason of the difficulty experienced in recognizing and describing the sermons of Faustus comes from the fact that his younger contemporaries and disciples, particularly Cæsarius of Arles, regularly drew from his sermons, recast them, or embodied them entirely in their own discourses. Engelbrecht claims as Faustus' property the pseudo-Eusebian *Homiliae 56 ad populum et monachos* (§ 61, 2), also a collection of 22 sermons still unedited. It must be admitted, however, that the Durlach (now Carlsruhe) manuscript contains other sermons that do not belong to Faustus, but to Cæsarius of Arles. The style of Faustus is vigorous and lively, but deficient in ease and grace. He seeks a certain effect in his exposition, and aims at

[1] Ib., liii. 683.

rhythmic cadence. His prolixity often renders his thought nebulous and vague. He loves to repeat himself; the same words and phrases recur over and over again in his writings.

3. WORKS ON FAUSTUS. PASCHASIUS. LUCIDUS. PAULINUS OF BURDIGALA. — The first complete edition of the writings of Faustus was published by *A. Engelbrecht*, Fausti Reiensis praeter sermones pseudo-Eusebianos opera. Accedunt Ruricii epistulae. Rec. A. E., Vienna, 1891 (Corpus script. eccles. lat., vol. xxi). *Engelbrecht* had already published as prolegomena to this edition: Studien über die Schriften des Bischofs von Reii Faustus, Vienna, 1889; cf. Zeitschr. für die österreich. Gymnasien (1890), xli. 289—301, and his epilegomena were: Patristische Analekten, Vienna, 1892. *Migne* published under the name of Faustus the: De gratia (PL., lviii. 783—836), nineteen letters (Ib., 835—870); the letter ad Lucidum presbyterum (Ib., liii., 681—683), and eight sermones (Ib., 869—890). — The evidence that Faustus wrote the De Spiritu Sancto was collected chiefly by *C. P. Caspari*, Ungedruckte Quellen zur Gesch. des Taufsymbols und der Glaubensregel, Christiania, 1869, ii. 214—224. After new researches *Engelbrecht* reached identical conclusions, Studien über die Schriften des Bischofs von Reii Faustus (1889), pp. 28—46. — There is extant one letter of Paschasius the Roman deacon (*Migne*, PL., lxii. 39—40). In the Katholik (1887), ii. 386—406, *S. Bäumer* undertook to identify the parvus libellus Adversus Arianos et Macedonianos with the Breviarium fidei adversus Arianos (*Migne*, l. c., xiii. 653—672); while *F. Cabrol*, in Revue des questions historiques (1890), xlvii. 232—243, identifies it with the Liber testimoniorum fidei first edited by Pitra under the name of St. Augustine (§ 94, 6 16). *Engelbrecht* thinks otherwise, in Zeitschr. für die österr. Gymnasien, l. c.; so again does *B. Rehling*, De Fausti Reiensis epist. tertia (epist. ad reverendissimum sacerdotum), Diss. inaug., Münster, 1898. Among the twelve letters in *Engelbrecht's* edition (pp. 159—220) are two addressed to Faustus, one by the aforesaid Lucidus (pp. 165—168), and the other (pp. 181—183) by a certain Paulinus of Burdigala (Bordeaux). The latter is perhaps identical with the author (*Gennad.*, De viris ill., c. 68) of certain treatises or tractatus de initio quadragesimae, de die dominico paschae, de obedientia, de poenitentia, de neophytis. An edition of all the letters of Faustus of Reji and Ruricius of Limoges was brought out by *Br. Krusch* as an appendix to the edition of Sidonius Apollinaris by *C. Lütjohann*, Monum. Germ. hist. Auct. antiquiss., Berlin, 1877, viii. 265 ff. In *Engelbrecht's* edition are found thirty-one sermons: Sermones codice Durlacensi servati (1—22), Sermones varii (23—31). The two pseudo-Eusebian homilies (9—10) treat of the creed, and are surely the work of Faustus; they were edited by *Caspari*, in Ungedruckte Quellen zur Gesch. des Taufsymbols und der Glaubensregel, Christiania, 1869, ii. 183—213, also in his Kirchenhistorische Anekdota, Christiania, 1883, i. 315—341. In Alte und neue Quellen etc., Christiania, 1879, pp. 250—281, he published for the first time an anonymous Tractatus de symbolo, that Engelbrecht considers to be a homily of Faustus, and not a compilation from his homilies, as the editor thinks. Cf. *Engelbrecht*, Studien etc., pp. 47—102: «Über die Predigten des Faustus und ihre Echtheit». *G. Morin*, in Revue Bénédictine (1892), ix. 49—61 (the reply of *Engelbrecht* is in Zeitschrift f. die österr. Gymn. [1892], xliii. 961—976, and [1893], x. 62—77), differs from *Engelbrecht* in his criticism of the composition of the sermons. *W. Bergmann*, in Studien zu einer kritischen Sichtung der südgallischen Predigtliteratur des 5. und 6. Jahrhunderts, I: Der handschriftlich bezeugte Nachlass des Faustus von Reji, Leipzig, 1898 (Studien zur Gesch.

der Theol. und der Kirche, i. 4) agrees substantially with *Morin*. The latter attributes also to Faustus the: De septem ordinibus ecclesiae (*Migne*, PL., xxx. 148—162) found amid the works of St. Jerome; cf. Revue Bénédictine (1891), viii. 97—104. *Engelbrecht* rejects this opinion of *Morin*, in Patristische Analekten (1892), pp. 5—19. *Caspari* edited (Briefe, Abhandlungen und Predigten etc., Christiania, 1890, pp. 202—206) an anonymous sermon on the question: «Why did Christ deliver humanity from the power of the devil not by divine power, but by His incarnation, fulfilment of the Law, passion and death?» This short and popular Cur Deus homo of the ancient Latin Church was probably composed by some younger contemporary writer in Southern Gaul; cf. *Caspari*, l. c., pp. 411—429. *A. Koch*, Der hl. Faustus, Bischof von Riez. Eine dogmengeschichtliche Monographie, Stuttgart, 1895. *F. Wörter*, Zur Dogmengeschichte des Semipelagianismus (II: Die Lehre des Faustus von Riez), Münster, 1900 (Kirchengeschichtliche Studien, v. 2).

4. LEONTIUS OF ARLES. RURICIUS OF LIMOGES. — A letter of Leontius, archbishop of Arles (see no. 2), to Pope Hilary in 462 is found amid the letters of that pope (§ 114, 1). Most of Pope Hilary's letters are addressed to Leontius (*Migne*, PL., lviii. 22—23); Epist. Rom. Pontif., ed. *Thiel*, i. 138—139; cf. Hist. litt. de la France, Paris, 1735 1865, ii. 511—514. — Ruricius (see no. 2), bishop of Limoges from 485 († after 507), left eighty-two letters (*Migne*, PL., lviii. 67—124) in two books, without any chronological order. They are of slight importance and are mostly complimentary epistles to friendly bishops like Faustus and Apollinaris Sidonius, and others. We have already mentioned (no. 3) the two new editions of these letters by *Br. Krusch* (1887) and *A. Engelbrecht* (1891). Both editions contain also eight letters of various individuals to Ruricius: in the manuscripts they are inserted after his letters; cf. Acta SS. Oct., Brussels, 1853, viii. 59 to 76. *Engelbrecht*, Patristische Analekten, Vienna, 1892, pp. 20—83.

5. CLAUDIANUS MAMERTUS. — Claudianus Ecdicius Mamertus, the aforementioned opponent of Faustus of Reji, was a priest of Vienne (in Dauphiné), and the chief support of his brother St. Mamertus, bishop of that see. He died about 474. His friend Apollinaris Sidonius has left us a very flattering necrology of him (Epist. iv. 11). About 468 or 469 Claudianus composed his work: De statu animae (*Migne*, PL,, liii. 697—780) in three books; in it he defends, against Faustus, the incorporeity of the human soul. He dedicated the work to Sidonius, who styles it (Epist. iv. 3; cf. v. 2) a work excellent in every way. In spite of some defects it merits the encomia of Sidonius. the author is evidently a disciple of St. Augustine, very learned for his time, and a skilful dialectician. Two of his letters are extant (*Migne*, l. c., liii. 779—786): one to Sidonius, and another to Sapaudus, a rhetorician of Vienne. Some hymns were formerly ascribed to him (Ib., liii. 785—790), but his authorship is now partly very doubtful, partly quite abandoned. Most of them (In Jacobum mag. eq., Carmen paschale, two Greek epigrams, Laus Christi, Miracula Christi) are also current under the name of Claudius Claudianus (§ 79, 5). Sidonius mentions (Ep. iv. 3) with praise a hymn of Claudian that has not yet been identified. — A new edition of the works of Claudianus Mamertus (minus the traditional poems) was published by *A. Engelbrecht*, Vienna, 1885 (Corpus Script. eccl. lat., vol. xi). The *Migne* text (PL., liii) is a reprint from *Gallandi*, Bibl. vet. Patr., x. The famous hymn: Pange lingua gloriosi, ascribed by Gallandi to Claudianus Mamertus, is really the work of Venantius Fortunatus (§ 117, 3). For the Carmina dubiae auctoritatis see *Teuffel-Schwabe*, Gesch. der röm. Lit., 5. ed., p. 1202. *M. Schulze*, Die Schrift des Claudianus Mamertus, Presbyters zu Vienne: «De statu

animae», im Auszuge mit kritischen Untersuchungen, Dresden, 1883. *A. Engelbrecht,* Untersuchungen über die Sprache des Claudianus Mamertus, Vienna, 1885. *R. de la Broise,* Mamerti Claudiani vita eiusque doctrina de anima hominis (Thèse), Paris, 1890.

6. ARNOBIUS JUNIOR. »PRAEDESTINATUS». VINCENTIUS. — Of Arnobius Junior, so called to distinguish him from Arnobius of Sicca, we know little save that he was born in Gaul and that he wrote (about 460) long Commentarii in Psalmos (*Migne,* PL., liii. 327—570). His exegesis is entirely allegorical; he is an opponent of St. Augustine's doctrine on grace. He is erroneously credited with the authorship of: Adnotationes ad quaedam evangeliorum loca (*Migne,* PL., liii. 569—580), a loose collection of scholia on particular passages in John, Matthew and Luke, freely pillaged by the pseudo-Theophilus of Antioch in his Gospel-commentary (§ 21, 3). In the Theol. Quartalschr. (1897), lxxix. 555—568, *B. Grundl* maintains that these Adnotationes were written before the reign of Constantine. *G. Morin* published in Pages inédites d'Arnobius le jeune: la fin des «expositiunculae» sur l'évangile, Revue Bénédictine (1903), xx. 64 to 76, a new and distinct recension of the fourth adnotatio on Luke, together with nine other adnotationes hitherto unknown, also incorporated with his Gospel-commentary by pseudo-Theophilus. Morin is of opinion that this Arnobius is probably an Illyrian, who lived at Rome; he maintains that he is the author of the Adnotationes, the Conflictus, and the Praedestinatus. The Conflictus Arnobii catholici cum Serapione Aegyptio (*Migne,* l. c., liii. 239—322) affects the form of a dialogue in presence of arbiters; it is an anti-Monophysite work that aims at proving the perfect concord of Rome (Leo I.) with the great doctors of the Alexandrine Church. The unquestioning acceptance by the author of the authority of St. Augustine prevents us from accepting it as a work of Arnobius; neither can it be attributed with *S. Bäumer,* Katholik (1887), ii. 398—406, to Faustus of Reji. *Grundl* thinks (l. c., pp. 529—568) that it was composed about 552 by a Roman monk Arnobius. — The anonymous work Praedestinatus sive praedestinatorum haeresis et libri S. Augustino temere adscripti refutatio (Ib., liii. 587—672) was first edited by *J. Sirmond* in 1643, and subdivided by him into three books. In the first are described ninety heresies from Simon Magus to the Predestinationists; in this narrative are many problematical or fabulous statements (this book is also printed in *Fr. Oehler,* Corpus haereseologicum, Berlin, 1856, i. 227—268); the second book describes the contents of an apology for Predestinationism current under the name of St. Augustine, while the third refutes the same from a Semipelagian standpoint. Intrinsic evidence points to Southern Gaul and the middle of the fifth century as place and time of composition; by reason of similarities of style and subject-matter the author of the Commentarii in Psalmos (Arnobius junior) may well be and probably is the author of «Praedestinatus». *V. H. v. Schubert,* Der sogen. Praedestinatus. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Pelagianismus. Texte und Untersuchungen, new series ix. 4, Leipzig, 1903. This writer rejects the authorship of Arnobius Junior, and suggests, with much reserve, the name of Anianus (§ 74, 14; 94, 6). *A. Faure,* Die Widerlegung der Häretiker im 1. Buche des Praedestinatus (Dissert.), Göttingen, 1903. The Commentarius in Psalmos of Vincentius, a priest of Southern Gaul in the second half of the fifth century, mentioned by *Gennadius* (De viris ill., c. 80), may be identical with the Commentarius in lxxv Psalmos, printed among the works of Rufinus (*Migne,* PL., 641—960; cf. 63—66). — *Gennadius* mentions (l. c., c. 75) ascetical works of Paulus, a priest of Pannonia between 450 and 500; they have perished.

## § 112. Other Gallic writers.

1. SALVIANUS OF MARSEILLES. — Salvianus was born of distinguished parents in Gaul and probably in the neighborhood of Cologne[1] towards the end of the fourth century In his youth he led a rather dissolute life. After his own conversion he succeeded in winning over his pagan wife Palladia, not only to the Christian faith, but to the practice of perfect continency in the married state. We still possess the touching letter in which Salvianus, his wife and daughter, justify their conduct to the parents of Palladia, themselves Christian converts, but incapable of comprehending such a state of continency[2] About 424, apparently, Salvianus was ordained to the priesthood and entered the monastery of Lérins[3]. At a later date he was living at Marseilles (till about 480), a vigorous old man[4]. He wrote many works, among which Gennadius mentions: De virginitatis bono ad Marcellum presbyterum libros tres, Adversum avaritiam libros quattuor, De praesenti iudicio libros quinque et pro eorum prooemio satisfactionis ad Salonium episcopum librum unum et expositionis extremae partis libri Ecclesiastes ad Claudium episcopum Viennensem librum unum, epistolarum librum unum et in morem Graecorum de principio Genesis usque ad conditionem hominis composuit versu Hexaemeron librum unum, homilias episcopis factas multas, sacramentorum vero quantas (?) nec recordor. Of these works only the Adversum avaritiam, the De praesenti iudicio, and nine letters remain. The first work, written between 435 and 439, is entitled in the manuscripts: Ad ecclesiam. It begins: Timotheus minimus servorum Dei ecclesiae catholicae toto orbe diffusae. As a check to the prevalent avarice that refused its own to God, that is to the Church and the poor, Salvianus urges on all Christians and particularly on ecclesiastics the duty of bestowing alms and gifts upon the Church; he insists especially on the obligation of making the Church one's heir by will. Such doctrine is better appreciated when we remember that all public care of the poor was then incumbent upon the Church, and that pauperism was assuming incredible proportions. In a letter (Ep. 9) to his disciple Salonius, bishop of Geneva (§ 96, 2), Salvianus explains the reason for his pseudonym Timotheus. Gennadius has erroneously connected this letter (Satisfactionis ad Salonium episcopum librum unum) with the work De praesenti iudicio. This latter work was finished between 439 and 451 and was dedicated to Salonius; in the manuscripts it is usually entitled: De gubernatione Dei, and is divided into eight books. Its aim is the defence and justification of divine Providence. Many were scandalized at this time by the evils that from all sides befell the

[1] *Salv.*, De gub. Dei, vi. 13, 72; Ep. 1.
[2] *Salv.*, Ep. 4.
[3] *Hilar. Arelat.*, Vita S. Honorati 4, 19.
[4] *Gennad.*, De viris ill., c. 67.

Roman empire and especially by the humiliations that the barbarian invasions inflicted upon the Romans. Salvianus asserts that almost the entire society of Christian Romans at the time was a sewer of iniquity: sentina vitiorum[1]. The barbarians, pagans and heretics, are morally superior to the Romans; the only privilege of the latter is their Catholic faith, and that can only aggravate their guilt. The ruin of the empire is a just judgment from God, long since merited; it is an irrefragable proof that God still governs the world. While the work Ad ecclesiam is truly a mirror of contemporary morality, the De gubernatione Dei reflects still more vividly the conditions of Roman civilization when it was written. These pages suggest at once Lactantius; they fascinate the reader by the purity of their diction and their rhetorical elevation, but it must be added that they are also very prolix and verbose.

The best of the old editions is that of *Etienne Baluze*, Paris, 1663 1669 1684 (reprinted in *Migne*, PL., liii). Recent editions are owing to *C. Halm*, Berlin, 1877 (Monum. Germ. hist. Auct. antiquiss., i. 1), and *Fr. Pauly*, Vienna, 1883 (Corpus script. eccles. lat., vol. viii). *A. Helf* translated into German the De gubernatione Dei, Kempten, 1877 (Bibliothek der Kirchenväter). *Fr. X. Hirner*, Commentatio de Salviano eiusque libellis (Progr.), Freising, 1869. *W. Zschimmer*, Salvianus, der Presbyter von Massilia, und seine Schriften, Halle, 1875. *A. Hämmerle*, Studien zu Salvian, Priester von Massilia (3 progrs.), Landshut, 1893, Neuburg, 1897 1899. *J. B. Ullrich*, De Salviani scripturae sacrae versionibus (Progr.), Neustadt, 1892. *G. Valran*, Quare Salvianus presbyter Massiliensis magister episcoporum a Gennadio dictus sit, Paris, 1899. *E. Woelfflin*, Alliteration und Reim bei Salvian, in Archiv für latein. Lexikogr. u. Gramm. (1902), xiii. 41—49. — Certain theological treatises of a practical nature by Musæus, a priest of Marseilles († ca. 460), mentioned by *Gennadius* (De viris ill., c. 79), have perished.

2. APOLLINARIS SIDONIUS. — Caius Sollius Modestus Apollinaris Sidonius was born at Lyons about 430, and died about 482 at Clermont. Mommsen and Duchesne[2] consider that his epitaph fixes the date of his death at Aug. 21. or 22., 479. He is the principal representative of that group of Gallic writers who professed Christian sentiments and even accepted ecclesiastical office, but whose works still reflected the genius of antique paganism. Sidonius belonged to one of the noblest families of Gaul, and had already attained distinguished civil honors when, in 469 or 470, he was suddenly and reluctantly made bishop of the *urbs Arverna* (now Clermont-Ferrand), an office that carried with it much political influence and authority. His literary career is evenly divided by this event. Hitherto he had indulged in poetical composition; there is still extant a collection of twenty-four *carmina*, among them three long and carefully executed panegyrics; one on the emperor Avitus his father-in-law, (delivered

[1] De gub. Dei, iii. 9, 44.

[2] Fastes épiscopaux de l'ancienne Gaule, Paris, 1900, ii. 34—35.

January 1., 456, in the Roman Senate), another on the emperor Majorian (at Lyons, end of 458), and the third on the emperor Anthemius (at Rome, Jan. 1., 468). The entire collection treats of profane themes and is pagan in its form; and it abounds in similes and metaphors taken from mythology. The models of Sidonius are Claudius Claudianus, Statius and Vergil, but his imitation of them does not go beyond the exhibition of rhetorical, dialectical and metrical skill. After his election to the see of Clermont, Sidonius abandoned this dilettantism as incompatible with the serious character of his new vocation[1]. He devoted himself instead to the composition of formal epistles, after the style of Symmachus and Pliny. They grew in number until they formed a collection in nine books, including letters that had long since got to their destination, and others composed with the express purpose of reaching the general public in this way. Both epistles and poetry are as rich in fine words as they are jejune in thought. The epistles, however, are a very valuable contribution to the history of contemporary Roman culture. They are often varied and enlivened by metrical pieces, sometimes of a spiritual character: inscriptions for new churches, epitaphs for pious Christians, and the like. Sidonius did not execute his intention of composing a metrical martyrology for Gaul[2]. His *contestatiunculae*[3] have perished, also the *missae*[4] composed by him. Indeed, we do not know what is meant by these titles.

His works have been excellently edited by *Chr. Lütjohann,* Gai Sollii Apollinaris Sidonii epistulae et carmina, rec. et emend. *Chr. Lütjohann,* in Monum. Germ. hist. Auct. antiquiss., Berlin, 1887, viii. After *Lütjohann's* death (April 8., 1884) *Fr. Leo* and *Th. Mommsen* completed his work. A minor edition of the writings of Sidonius is owing to *P. Mohr,* Leipzig, 1895. The edition of *J. Sirmond,* Paris, 1614 1652, is reprinted in *Migne,* PL., lviii. A French version of all the writings of Sidonius (with Latin text and notes) was made by *J. F. Grégoire* and *F. Z. Collombet,* Lyons and Paris, 1836, 3 vols. *G. Kaufmann,* Die Werke des C. S. A. Sidonius als eine Quelle für die Geschichte seiner Zeit (Inaug.-Diss.), Göttingen, 1864. *L. A. Chaix,* S. Sidoine-Apollinaire et son siècle, Clermont-Ferrand, 1867—1868, 2 vols. *M. Büdinger,* Apollinaris Sidonius als Politiker, Vienna, 1881. *M. Müller,* De Apollinaris Sidonii latinitate (Diss. inaug.), Halle, 1888. *E. Grupe,* Zur Sprache des Apollinaris Sidonius (Progr.), Zabern, 1892. For other works and dissertations see *Teuffel-Schwabe,* Gesch. der röm. Lit., pp. 1199—1200. *J. Nicolas,* La médecine dans les œuvres de Sidoine-Apollinaire, in Revue médicale du Mont-Dore, Clermont-Ferrand, 1901. *K. Weyman,* Apollinaris Sidonius und die miracula S. Fidis, in Hist. Jahrbuch (1899), xx. 53—71. *P. Magaud,* Un évêque des Gaules au V siècle, in Annales de St. Louis-de-Francais (1901), v. 435—473. — For details concerning some contemporary Gallic poets mentioned by our author: Consentius, Lampridius, Leo, Peter, Severianus, Proclus, and others, see *Teuffel-Schwabe,* l. c., pp. 1191—1194, and *Manitius,* Gesch. der christl.

[1] Ep. 9, 12, and the carmen in Ep. 9, 16.
[2] Cf. the carmen in Ep. 9, 16, 61 ff. [3] Ep. 7, 3.
[4] *Greg. Tur.,* Hist. Franc., ii. 22.

latein. Poesie, Stuttgart, 1891, pp. 235—237 Auspicius, bishop of Toul (about 470) and a friend of Sidonius, left a metrical Epistola ad Arbogastem comitem Treverorum (*Migne*, PL., lxi. 1005—1008) edited by *W Gundlach*, in Monum. Germ. hist. Epist. (1892), iii. 135—137; cf. *Manitius*, l. c., pp. 232—234.

3. PAULINUS OF PELLA AND PAULINUS OF PETRICORDIA. — Both are Christian poets in the strict sense of the term. The first was born, probably about 376, at Pella in Macedonia, but came to Bordeaux at the age of three years, where he was brought up in the house of his grandfather Ausonius (§ 88, 5). The remainder of his chequered life was spent in Southern Gaul. In 459, being then eighty-four years of age, he composed his: Eucharisticos Deo sub ephemeridis meae textu, in six hundred and sixteen hexameters; it is an autobiography in the form of thanksgiving to God. Both prosody and metre are somewhat neglected in this poem; it is nevertheless an attractive narrative and faithfully portrays the sentiments of a candid and pious soul that amid many sufferings clung to its faith in divine Providence. — We know Paulinus of Petricordia (Périgueux) only as the author of an epic poem finished about 470: De vita S. Martini episc. libri vi. The first three books are an expansion of the *Vita Martini* of Sulpicius Severus (§ 92, 1); the fourth and fifth are composed from the two dialogues of Severus (ib.), while the sixth is taken from an account of the miracles of St. Martin written after his death by Perpetuus, bishop of Tours (458—488). Perpetuus had induced Paulinus to write the work which is dedicated to him. Two shorter poems written at a later date are added by way of appendix: one of eighty hexameters on the miraculous cure of a little nephew of Paulinus by laying upon him the book of Perpetuus (Versus Paulini de visitatione nepotuli sui) and an inscription in twenty-five hexameters for the new basilica built by Perpetuus in honor of St. Martin (Versus Paulini de orantibus).

The Eucharisticos of Paulinus of Pella was first edited in 1579 by M. de la Bigne. The most recent editions are those by *L. Leipziger*, Breslau, 1858, and *W. Brandes*, in Poetae christiani minores, part I, Vienna, 1888 (Corpus script. eccles. lat., vol. xvi), pp. 263—334. His writings are not in Migne. *J. Rocafort*, De Paulini Pellaei vita et carmine (Thèse), Bordeaux, 1890. — Paulinus of Petricordia was first edited, Paris, 1589, by *Fr. Juretus* (*Migne*, PL., lxi. 1009—1076). Recent editions are owing to *E. F. Corpet*, Paris, 1852, and *M. Petschenig*, in Poetae christiani minores, part I, pp. 1—190. *A. Huber*, Die poetische Bearbeitung der Vita S. Martini des Sulpicius Severus durch Paulinus von Périgueux (Progr.), Kempten, 1901. — The above mentioned account of the miracles of St. Martin by Perpetuus of Tours has perished. The Testamentum and Epitaphium Perpetui episc. (*Migne*, PL., lviii. 753—756) are forgeries of Vignier; cf. Julien Havet (§ 3, 2). There is a letter to Perpetuus among the aforesaid epistles of Sidonius (vii. 9).

4. GENNADIUS OF MARSEILLES. — We possess but little exact information concerning the priest Gennadius of Marseilles, an histo-

rian of ecclesiastical literature, who flourished in the latter half of the fifth century. In an addition to his *De viris illustribus* (§ 2, 2) made by a later hand we read the following: Scripsi adversum omnes haereses libros viii et adversum Nestorium libros v et adversus Eutychen libros x et adversus Pelagium libros iii et tractatus de mille annis, de Apocalypsi beati Johannis et hoc opus et epistolam de fide mea missam ad beatum Gelasium episcopum urbis Romae. He tells us himself[1] that he translated into Latin some works of Greek ecclesiastical writers, particularly writings of Evagrius Ponticus (§ 70, 4). Most of the works of Gennadius have perished. His *De ecclesiasticis dogmatibus*, still extant, is usually identified with the *Epistola de fide mea*. It is really a kind of profession of faith, though it is not epistolary in form, nor does it, with one exception (laudo, vitupero, c. 23) appear as a personal document. Caspari suggests, perhaps correctly, that it is a remnant of the Libri viii adversus omnes haereses, or to speak more particularly, its conclusion. The actual text is copiously interpolated, but in its original form it was probably composed in some circle of Semipelagians, then very numerous in Southern Gaul. Even the De viris illustribus of Gennadius (§ 2, 2) exhibits traces of Semipelagianism, e. g. in the articles on John Cassian, Faustus of Reji, and Hilary of Arles, also in the accounts of St. Augustine, Prosper of Aquitaine, and the popes of the period.

The editio princeps of the De ecclesiasticis dogmatibus was brought out by *G. Elmenhorst,* Hamburg, 1614 (*Migne,* PL., lviii. 979—1054, and *Fr. Oehler,* Corpus haereseologicum, Berlin, 1856, i. 335—400). The integrity of the original text is discussed by *C. Fr. Arnold,* Cäsarius von Arelate, Leipzig, 1894, pp. 535 f. *C. H. Turner,* The Liber Ecclesiasticorum Dogmatum attributed to Gennadius, in Journal of Theol. Studies (1905), vii. 78—99. A profession of faith entitled. Gennadius Massiliensis episc. de fide disputans inter caetera dixit, is discussed by *C. P. Caspari,* Kirchenhistorische Anekdota, Christiania, 1883, i. 301—304; cf. xix—xxiii.

5. AVITUS OF VIENNE. — Saint Alcimus Ecdicius Avitus, bishop of Vienne about 490—518, has been justly called the pillar of Catholic faith and the soul of ecclesiastical life in the Burgundian kingdom. His influence brought about the conversion to Catholicism of the Arian king Sigismund (516—523). He was an indefatigable opponent of all heresy, and especially of Semipelagianism; and at the same time his zeal for a closer union with the Roman Church contrasts strongly with the dissentient spirit of the Orientals that culminated in the Acacian schism. Avitus considered that intimate relations with the Apostolic See were necessary to ensure and further the welfare of Christian civilization and the maintenance of religious authority. His well-known phrase clearly exhibits this point of view: Si papa urbis vocatur in dubium, episcopatus iam videbitur, non episcopus, vacillare[2].

[1] De viris ill., cc. 11 72. [2] Ep. 34, ed. *Peiper.*

Foremost among his writings is an hexameter poem in five books, casually described by himself[1] as: Libelli de spiritalis historiae gestis. The title of each book is as follows: de mundi initio, de originali peccato, de sententia Dei, de diluvio mundi, de transitu maris rubri. The first three books supplement one another and form within the larger work a kind of minor cycle, the subject-matter of which is original sin or the loss of Paradise. The first book depicts what took place before the Fall, the third book relates its fatal consequences, while the catastrophe itself is the subject of the second; it is this second book which exhibits Avitus at his best as a dramatic writer. In the fourth and fifth books the deluge and the passage of the Red Sea are described as figures symbolical of baptism. In the first three books the high poetic genius of Avitus finds full play; they are characterized by unity of thought and arrangement and by complete mastery over the entire scriptural material. His poetical gift appears to less advantage in his panegyric *De virginitate* or: De consolatoria castitatis laude. This poem of six hundred and sixty-six hexameters was addressed to his sister Fuscina, a virgin dedicated to the service of God from her earliest youth, but whose soul suffered from many grievous temptations. Avitus shows at all times an intimate knowledge of Vergil and Sidonius (see no. 2). His versification exhibits few errors in prosody or metre, and the diction is comparatively pure and correct. His prose works, however, abound in barbarisms; it is well-known that contemporary Latin prose was everywhere in a more advanced condition of decay than Latin poetry. Of these works there still remain: Contra Eutychianam haeresim libri ii, written in 512 or 513, and: Dialogi cum Gundobado rege vel librorum contra Arianos reliquiae. We possess also about one hundred letters of Avitus, written between 495 and 518, very valuable for the ecclesiastical and political history of the time. His homilies were once extant in a collection, but apart from some fragments and excerpts only two: Homilia in rogationibus, and: Sermo die prima rogationum, have been preserved.

The editio princeps of Avitus is that by *J. Sirmond,* S. J., Paris, 1643; until lately all editions followed this text, even *Migne,* PL., lix. The first to undertake and complete a new edition based on a thorough examination of the manuscripts was *R. Peiper,* Alcimi Ecdicii Aviti Viennensis episc. opera quae supersunt, Berlin, 1883 (Monum. Germ. hist. Auct. antiquiss., vi. 2). The latest editor of Avitus is *U. Chevalier,* Œuvres complètes de St. Avite, évêque de Vienne, Lyons, 1890. The appendix added by *Peiper* to the prose writings of Avitus contains among other things an ancient Vita S. Aviti (pp. 177—181) and a metrical Epitaphium S. Aviti (pp. 185 to 186; *Migne,* PL., lix. 197—198). There is in *Peiper,* pp. 161—164, and *Migne,* PL., lix. 387—392, a narrative of a religious colloquy between orthodox bishops and Arians held at Lyons in 499 before King Gundobad,

[1] Ep. 51, ed. *Peiper.*

in which Avitus, as the Catholic spokesman, won a splendid victory; Havet (§ 3, 2) showed (1885) that this piece was a forgery of Vignier, and that he also forged the letter of Pope Symmachus to Avitus (Oct. 13., 501: Ep. 33, in the *Peiper* edition; *Migne*, PL., lxii. 51—52). Cf. *F. Desloge*, in Université catholique, new series (1890), iv. 67—80. *V. Cucheval*, De S. Aviti Viennae episc. operibus commentarium, Paris, 1863. *C. Binding*, Das Burgundisch-Romanische Königreich (443—532 A. D.), Leipzig, 1868, i. 168—179 290—297. *A. Charaux*, St. Avite, évêque de Vienne en Dauphiné, sa vie, ses œuvres, Paris, 1876. *H. Denkinger*, Alcimus Ecdicius Avitus, archevêque de Vienne, 460—526, et la destruction de l'Arianisme en Gaule (Thèse), Geneva, 1890. — On the De spiritalis historiae gestis see *S. Gamber*, Le livre de la Genèse dans la poésie latine au V^e^ siècle, Paris, 1899. *G. Losgar*, Studien zu Alcimus Ecdicius Avitus' «Gedicht» De spiritalis historiae gestis, Neuburg, 1903. *F. Vernet*, St. Avite, in Dict. de la Théologie, Paris, 1903, i. 2639—2444.

6. ST. CÆSARIUS OF ARLES. — Cæsarius, bishop of Arles (503—543), is a type of those active, self-sacrificing prelates of Southern Gaul who, during the dissolution of the imperial power in the West, saved Christian civilization from total ruin, by grafting it upon the new political life of the barbarian conquerors. His episcopal city of Arles, where he lived and labored for forty years, was admirably adapted for such a mission, being the political meeting place of Ostrogoths and Visigoths, Franks and Burgundians. It was here in stirring times, alive with important social and religious problems, that Cæsarius labored as a shepherd of souls, reformer of ecclesiastical discipline, and popular preacher of practical Christianity; he is perhaps the greatest popular preacher of the ancient Latin Church. In all these departments his influence was both beneficent and durable. The writings of Cæsarius consist mostly of sermons. One of his first biographers tells us that he wrote on many and varied subjects, and sent his sermons to France, Gaul, Italy and Spain, that they might be serviceable to the clergy and the people of these countries[1]. No critical collection of these sermons has reached us, and it is therefore a very difficult task to separate the genuine work of Cæsarius from the spurious pieces (cf. § 111, 2). The genuine sermons are distinguished for simplicity, clearness, and the relative purity of their diction. Most of them were written for the average Christian, and are remarkable for the numerous similes drawn from nature and the common daily life of his time. A more select group of these discourses was meant for monks. He also composed two monastic rules *Ad virgines* and *Ad monachos;* the former, which is also the longer of the two, was revised by him in a later *recapitulatio*. He left also some letters, and a last will and testament under the form of a letter to his successor. Unless his work *De gratia et libero arbitrio* be identical with the decrees of the Second Council of Orange (529), it has

[1] Vita S. Caesarii, i. 5, 42.

perished. Cæsarius presided over this famous synod which gave the death-blow to Semipelagianism.

There exists as yet no complete edition of the works of St. Cæsarius: such an edition, however, is being prepared by *G. Morin,* O. S. B. For former editions of his sermons see *Fessler-Jungmann,* Instit. Patrol., ii 2, 438—447. Most of his printed sermons are found among the Sermones supposititii S. Augustini, in the fifth volume of the Benedictine edition of St. Augustine (cf. § 94, 10), reprinted in *Migne,* PL., xxxix. 1735 ff. Other sermons of St. Cæsarius are in *Migne,* PL., lxvii. 1041—1094 1121—1125. Some new sermons were edited by *C. P. Caspari,* Kirchenhistor. Anekdota, Christiania, 1883, 213 f. Briefe, Abhandlungen und Predigten etc., ib., 1890, pp. 200 f. *Morin* also published others, in Revue Bénédictine (1896), xiii. 97—111 193—214; (1899), xvi. 241—260 289—305 337—344. A number of sermons were translated into German by *C. Fr. Arnold,* in *Leonhardi-v. Langsdorff,* Die Predigt der Kirche, Leipzig, 1896. In addition to the sermons the reader will find in *Migne,* PL., lxvii, the aforesaid Vita S. Cæsarii (1001—1042), Regula ad monachos (1099—1104), Regula ad virgines (1105—1121), Epistolae iii (1125—1138), Testamentum (1139—1142). The Epistola de humilitate ad monachos was edited by *C. Fr. Arnold,* Cäsarius von Arelate, Leipzig, 1894, pp. 468—490, and the Testamentum by *Morin,* in Rev. Bénéd. (1899), xvi. 97—112. For a hitherto unknown Admonitio S. Cæsarii to the clergy concerning the preaching of the Word of God cf. *A. Malnory,* St. Césaire, évêque d'Arles, Paris, 1894, pp. 294—307. *G. Morin* and *Baltus* published, in Rev. Bénéd. (1869), xiii. 433—443 and 486, a little treatise hitherto unknown, concerning divine grace. In the Mélanges de littér. et d'hist. relig. dedicated to Mgr. *Cabrières,* Paris, 1899, i. 109—124, Morin claims for St. Cæsarius the authorship of a De mysterio sanctae Trinitatis attributed to St. Augustine and to Faustus of Reji; he also edited it partially (ib.). — For the writings of Cæsarius in general cf. *U. Villevieille,* Histoire de St. Césaire, évêque d'Arles, Aix in Provence (1884). *B. F Gellert,* Cäsarius von Arelate (2 progrs.), Leipzig, 1892—1893. *Arnold,* l. c.; *Malnory,* l. c. — Julianus Pomerius, a priest and rhetorician of Arles, and master of Cæsarius, wrote several works that have perished (*Gennad.,* De viris ill., c. 98; *Isid. Hisp.,* De viris ill., c. 25); his excellent pastoral instruction for priests, quite filled with the spirit of St. Augustine, has reached us; it is generally known as a De vita contemplativa (*Migne,* PL., lix. 415—520), though only the first book treats of that subject; the second is devoted to the active life, and the third to the virtues and the vices. Cf. Histoire littéraire de la France, Paris, 1735, ii. 665 to 675, and *Arnold,* Cäsarius von Arelate, Leipzig, 1894, pp. 80—84 124 to 129. — Under the name of St. Eleutherus (Eleutherius), bishop of Tournay (486—531), some Sermones have reached us (*Migne,* PL., lxv. 82—102) that are genuine in part only; cf. *Streber,* in Wetzer und Welte, Kirchenlexikon, iv. 361. — St. Remigius (Rémi), the famous apostle of the Franks, bishop of Reims (459—533), left four letters, a testament and a metrical inscription for a chalice (*Migne,* PL., lxv. 963—975). The letters were edited anew by *W. Gundlach,* in Monum. Germ hist. Epist. (1892), iii. 112—116. In Neues Archiv der Gesellsch. für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde (1895), xx. 538 ff., *Br Krusch* pronounces the «Testamentum» a forgery of Hinkmar of Reims. Remigius wrote a collection of homilies (declamationum volumina Apoll. Sidon. Ep. ix. 7) that have perished. — Aurelianus, bishop of Arles (546—551 or 553), left a regula ad monachos and a Regula ad virgines, in which he re-arranged and enlarged the si-

milar works of St. Cæsarius; he wrote also an Epistola ad Theodebertum regem (*Migne,* PL., lxviii. 385—408, and in *Gundlach,* l. c., pp. 124—126). *P. Lejay,* Césaire d'Arles, in Dict. de la Théologie, Paris, 1905, 2168—2186.

### § 113. Irish, Spanish, and African writers.

1. ST. PATRICK. — In spite of much scientific investigation, the details of the life of the Apostle of Ireland are still shrouded in obscurity. Patricius, or Succat (his original name), is said to have been born in 373. His birth-place, according to some, was Kilpatrick near Dumbarton in south-western Scotland; others maintain that he was born at Boulogne-sur-Mer in the North of France. He was commissioned by Pope Celestine I. to go as an apostle to the Irish, and received from him the name of Patricius. He is said to have died in 493, at the advanced age of one hundred and twenty years. Two of the works current under his name are usually recognized as genuine, a *Confessio,* in the form of an open letter to the Irish, and an *Epistola ad Coroticum* or: ad Christianos Corotici tyranni subditos. The Confessio does not contain a statement of his faith or his teachings, but rather an account of his life or missionary labors. Coroticus was an Irish prince who had attacked a number of newly-converted Irish, slain some and carried others into captivity. The genuineness of both works has lately been again denied. There is much less evidence for the genuineness of other writings attributed to Patrick.

*W. B. Morris,* The life of St. Patrick, Dublin, 1878. Archbishop *Healy,* Ireland's ancient schools and scholars, Dublin, 1890, pp. 43—89. *J. Sanderson,* The Story of St. Patrick, London, 1902. All earlier editions of the writings of St. Patrick are described in *Schoenemann,* Bibl. hist.-lit. Patr. lat., ii. 849 ff. The reader will find in *Migne,* PL., liii, not only the Confessio (801—814) and the Epistola ad Coroticum (813—818), but the following pseudo-Patrician writings: Synodus S. Patricii (817—822), Canones alii S. Patricio adscripti (823—824), Synodus episcoporum Patricii, Auxilii, Issernini (823—826), Canones alii S. Patricio attributi (827—828), Proverbia aliqua S. Patricii (827—828), Charta S. Patricii (827—830), S. Patricii episc. de tribus habitaculis liber (831—838), Hymnus alphabeticus in laudem S. Patricii tum viventis Secundino episc. adscriptus (837—840). *Whitley Stokes* (The tripartite life of Patrick, London, 1887, ii. 269—489) edited the following: Documents from the Book of Armagh, The Confession of St. Patrick, St. Patrick's Letter to the Christian Subjects of Coroticus, Preface to the Faed Fiada, Secundinus' Hymn, Preface to the foregoing Hymn, Fiacc's Hymn, Ninnine's Prayer, Homily on St. Patrick. *George T. Stokes* and *Ch. H. H. Wright,* The writings of St. Patrick, the apostle of Ireland, with notes, critical and historical, London, 1887. *J. v. Pflugk-Harttung,* Die Schriften St. Patricks, in Neue Heidelberger Jahrbücher (1893), iii. 71 to 87, denies against Whitley Stokes the genuineness of the Confessio and the Epistola ad Coroticum. The bishop Secundinus was a nephew of St. Patrick. For the Hymnus abecedarius on St. Patrick cf. *Manitius,* Gesch. der christl.-lat. Poesie, Stuttgart, 1891, pp. 238—240. *S. Malone,* Chapters towards a life of St. Patrick, Dublin, 1892. *J. B. Bury,* The

Life of St. Patrick and his place in History, London, 1905; cf. Catholic University Bulletin, Washington, 1906, pp. 246—255. On St. Patrick's Purgatory, see *H. Delehaye,* Le Pèlerinage de Laurent de Pasytho au Purgatoire de St. Patrice, in Analecta Bollandiana (1908), xxxii 1, 35—60.

2. HYDATIUS. — The Spaniard Hydatius (Idacius), born at Lemica in Gallecia (Jinzo de Lima in Portugal), consecrated bishop in 427, probably of Aquae Flaviae (Chaves), continued the Chronicle of St. Jerome (§ 93, 6) to the year 468. From the year 427 he is a contemporary witness of the events he narrates; hence the value of his work for Spanish history of the fifth century, particularly that of his native province of Gallecia.

The Chronicle of Hydatius was first edited by *Ludovicus de S. Laurentio* under the pseudonym of *Paulus Profitius,* Rome, 1615. It is twice printed in *Migne,* PL., li. 873—890, from the edition of *Sirmond* (Paris, 1619) or rather from the reprint of that edition in *Gallandi,* Max. Bibl. vet. Patr. x. 323 ff.; and again PL., lxxiv. 701—750, from the edition of *J. M. Garzon* and *F. X. De Ram,* Brussels, 1845. It was recently edited anew by *Th. Mommsen,* Chronica minora saec. iv v vi vii, vol. ii (Monum. Germ. hist. Auct. antiquiss., Berlin, 1894, xi. 13—36). In the same Chron. min. vol. i (Monum. Germ. hist. Auct. antiquiss., 1892, ix. 205—247), *Mommsen* published the Fasti Consulares for the years 245—468 (*Migne,* PL., li. 891 to 914) appended to the Chronicle in the only extant manuscript, which *Mommsen* entitled: Consularia Constantinopolitana ad a. 395 cum additamento Hydatii ad a. 468 (accedunt consularia Chronici Paschalis). The provenance of these consular lists is discussed, in a sense hostile to *Mommsen,* by *C. Frick,* Die Fasti Idatiani und das Chronicon Paschale, in Byzantinische Zeitschrift (1892), i. 282—291. For the person of Hydatius cf. *P. B. Gams,* Die Kirchengeschichte von Spanien, Ratisbon, 1864, ii 1, 465—471. *J. Chr. F. Baehr,* Die christl. Dichter und Geschichtschreiber Roms, 2. ed., Karlsruhe, 1872, pp. 208—212.

3. VICTOR OF VITA. — Victor, bishop of Vita in the African province of Byzacena, composed in 486 a history of the persecutions inflicted by the Arian Vandals on the Catholics of Africa. It is known as: Historia persecutionis Africanae provinciae temporibus Geiserici et Hunirici regum Wandalorum. He owed to others the material of the first book that covers the reign of Geiseric (427 to 477). The other two books have a much greater historical value, since in them the author relates the events of his own time, the reign of Huneric (477—484). He speaks often as an eye-witness, and furnishes important documents: we owe to him the text of an exhaustive profession of faith (ii. 56—101) made by the Catholic bishops at the conference with the Arian bishops held in Carthage, February 1., 484, also the edict of persecution issued by Huneric (iii. 3—14) on February 24., 484. The work was formerly edited in five books; they have been reduced to three in modern editions. The narrative of Victor, set down amid the still vivid impressions of the frightful cruelties of the Vandals, is very boldly colored, and the style is quite unpolished. To the manuscripts of Victor's work is

appended a: Passio beatissimorum martyrum (seven monks) qui apud Carthaginem passi sunt sub impio rege Hunirico (die vi. Non. Julias 483); from the manuscripts it has passed into the editions of Victor, though it is not by him, but by some contemporary African. There is also published in the editions of Victor a: Notitia provinciarum et civitatum Africae, i. e. a list according to their respective provinces, of the Catholic bishops whom king Huneric convoked at Carthage for the conference of February 1., 484.

The latest and best editions of the works of Victor are those of *C. Halm,* Berlin, 1879 (Monum. Germ. hist. Auct. antiquiss. iii. 1), and *M. Petschenig,* Vienna, 1881 (Corpus script. eccles. lat. vii). For a reprint of earlier editions see *Migne* (PL., lviii. 179—276) and *Hurter* (Ss. Patr. opusc. sel. xxii). German versions were made by *M. Zink,* Bamberg, 1883 (Progr.), and *A. Mally,* Vienna, 1884. Cf. *W. Pötzsch,* Viktor von Vita und die Kirchenverfolgung im Wandalenreiche (Progr.), Döbeln, 1887. *F. Ferrère,* De Victoris Vitensis libro qui inscribitur historia persecutionis Africanae provinciae (Thèse), Paris, 1898. *A. Schönfelder,* De Victore Vitensi episc. (Diss. inaug.), Breslau, 1889. *F. Ferrère,* Langue et style de Victor de Vita, in Revue de Philologie (1901), xxv. 110—123 320—336. — The above-mentioned profession of faith of the Catholic bishops of Africa was drawn up by Eugenius, bishop of Carthage (480—505), to whom we also owe an: Epistola ad cives suos pro custodienda fide catholica (*Migne,* PL., lviii. 769—771). This heroic confessor of the faith wrote other works (*Gennad.,* De viris ill., c. 97) that have perished. — Cerealis, bishop of Castellum in Mauretania Cæsariensis, called Cerealis Castello-Ripensis in the Notitia, left a short treatise: Contra Maximinum Arianum (*Migne,* PL., lviii. 757—768). Cf. *Rausch,* in Wetzer und Welte, Kirchenlexikon, iii. 14. Antoninus Honoratus, bishop of Constantina (Cirta) in Numidia, wrote a beautiful letter of consolation and encouragement to a certain Arcadius, whom Geiseric had exiled for his attachment to his faith (*Migne,* PL., l. 567—570); cf. *Bardenhewer,* in Kirchenlexikon, vi. 227 f. — We regret the loss of several anti-Arian works written by Catholic bishops in the time of Geiseric and Huneric, e. g. by Asclepius, bishop of a little place near Vaga in Numidia (*Gennad.,* De viris ill., c. 73; *G. Mercati,* in Rivista bibliog. ital. [1897], ii. 58—59); Victor of Cartenna in Mauretania Cæsariensis (*Gennad.,* l. c., c. 77), and Voconius, bishop of Castellum (*Gennad.,* l. c., c. 78). Two works of Victor of Cartenna, mentioned by Gennadius: De poenitentia publica and Ad Basilium quendam super mortem filii, are perhaps still extant, the first in the pseudo-Ambrosian De poenitentia (*Migne,* PL., xvii. 971—1004), and the other in the pseudo-Basilian De consolatione in adversis (*Migne,* PG., xxxi. 1687—1704). Some sermons, possibly the work of Voconius, are discussed by *G. Morin,* in Revue Bénédictine (1893), x. 529.

4. VIGILIUS OF TAPSUS. — Among those who took part in the above-mentioned conference at Carthage between Catholics and Arians (see no. 3) was Vigilius, bishop of Tapsus in the province of Byzacena. At this conference there was no genuine discussion. Later on most of the Catholic bishops were exiled. We have no certain knowledge concerning the fate of the bishop of Tapsus. It has been commonly maintained that he took refuge at Constantinople, but this seems

now untenable. The researches of Ficker (1897) have made clear a number of facts concerning the literary labors of Vigilius. He is without doubt the author of the dialogue: Contra Arianos, Sabellianos et Photinianos (Athanasio, Ario, Sabellio, Photino et Probo iudice interlocutoribus), and of the five books: Contra Eutychetem, composed as an antidote to Monophysitism in view of the needs of readers in the Eastern empire. In this second work he quotes himself (v. 2) as the author of the «dialogue», while in the latter he mentions two other works written by him: a book against the Arian deacon Maribadus (ii. 45) and one against the Arian bishop Palladius (ii. 50). So far it has been impossible to identify these two works; they seem to have perished. Chifflet published (1664), and under the name of our Vigilius: Contra Marivadum Arianum and Contra Palladium Arianum, but the latter is known to be a spurious work, and there can be no doubt that such is also the character of the former. As to the other four works that Chifflet attributes to Vigilius: a dialogue Contra Arianos (a rudely executed excerpt of the genuine «dialogue»), twelve books De trinitate, a work Contra Felicianum Arianum, the short and insignificant Solutiones obiectionum Arianorum and a Collatio cum Pascentio Ariano: they are ascribed to our author either erroneously or with insufficient arguments.

The last complete edition of the works of Vigilius (with those of Victor of Vita) is owing to *P. Fr. Chifflet,* S. J., Dijon, 1664 (*Migne,* PL., lxii, Paris, 1848 1863). The Contra Marivadum Arianum is mentioned in § 89, 3, apropos of the anti-Priscillianist Itacius. The first book of the Contra Palladium Arianum (Ib., lxii. 433—463) contains only the acts of the Synod of Aquileia (381); cf. *Hefele,* Konziliengeschichte, 2. ed., ii. 35, adn. 3; the second book is identical with the De fide orthodoxa contra Arianos that was apparently composed by Gregory of Eliberis (§ 87, 4). The twelve books De Trinitate (Ib., lxii. 237—334) bear in the manuscript the name of St. Athanasius; Montfaucon was inclined, perhaps rightly, to see in the twelfth book a genuine work of St. Athanasius (§ 63, 3 10; § 87, 4). The work Contra Felicianum Arianum has come down under the name of St. Augustine (Ib., xlii. 1157—1172), as has also the Collatio cum Pascentio Ariano (Ib., xxxiii. 1156—1162). Cf. *G. Ficker,* Studien zu Vigilius von Tapsus, Leipzig, 1897.

5. ST. FULGENTIUS OF RUSPE. — The African writer Fulgentius was probably the best theologian of his time. He was an able adversary of Arianism, while the Augustinian doctrine of grace found in him a skilful exponent. He was born at Telepte in Byzacena in 468 and died in 533 as bishop of Ruspe in the same province. Our knowledge of his life is drawn from an excellent historical source, the *Vita S. Fulgentii,* composed in 533—534, and according to tradition by Fulgentius Ferrandus, a disciple of the Saint. Our Fulgentius belonged to a distinguished family and received a very careful education. The commentary of St. Augustine on the thirty-sixth Psalm (Vulgate) moved the pious youth to embrace the monas-

tic life. After many sufferings and persecutions on the part of the Arians, he quitted Africa and lived for a while in Sicily and at Rome. He was then for many years the abbot of a monastery; in 507 or 508 he was reluctantly made bishop of the little maritime town of Ruspe. Shortly afterward, together with more than sixty other Catholic bishops of Byzacena, he was exiled to Sardinia by king Thrasamund (496—523). Somewhat later, about 515, the king felt the need of his counsel in the course of some doctrinal discussions, and recalled to Carthage the famous theologian, whence he was again banished to Sardinia about 519 by Arian intrigues. The accession of the lenient Hilderic in 523 made it possible for him and the other exiled African bishops to return to their native land. After ten more years of pastoral labors Fulgentius died in 533. — Most of his writings are either anti-Arian in scope or treat of the mystery of the Incarnation. His treatise: Contra Arianos, was written to answer the ten questions proposed to him by Thrasamund about 515. Another work: Ad Thrasamundum regem Vandalorum, was composed in reply to new objections of the king. The author of the Vita S. Fulgentii tells us (cc. 23, 47; 24, 48) that this work was followed by another (opus): Adversus Pintam, and by a short treatise (commonitorium parvissimum): De Spiritu Sancto. The latter work is now represented by two fragments, while the former work has perished. The treatise: Pro fide Catholica adversus Pintam episcopum Africanum, printed in the editions of Fulgentius, is spurious. The following works are apparently of a later date: De Trinitate ad Felicem notarium, Contra sermonem Fastidiosi Ariani ad Victorem, De incarnatione Filii Dei et vilium animalium auctore ad Scarilam. We possess still thirty-nine precious fragments of the ten books: Contra Fabianum Arianum. — Fulgentius was first drawn into the discussion of questions concerning grace by the Scythian monks (§ 102, 2). In 519 or 520 they submitted their doctrinal opinions to the judgment of the exiled African bishops in Sardinia, who through Fulgentius opposed the formula: «one of the Trinity suffered in the flesh», and took sides with the monks in their conflict with Faustus of Reji[1]. During his Sardinian exile Fulgentius wrote: De remissione peccatorum ad Euthymium libri ii, Ad Monimum libri iii (i. De duplice praedestinatione Dei, una bonorum ad gloriam, altera malorum ad poenam; ii. De sacrificii oblatione, de Spiritus Sancti missione, de supererogatione beati Pauli; iii. De vera expositione illius dicti evangelici: et Verbum erat apud Deum), Contra Faustum libri vii. The latter work[2] has perished. After his return from exile (523) Fulgentius wrote in Africa: De veritate praedestinationis et gratiae Dei ad Joannem et Venerium; he composed also in the same year the Epistola Synodica of the African bishops concerning

[1] *S. Fulg.*, Ep. 17 de incarnatione et gratia. [2] Vita S. Fulg., c. 28, 54.

grace[1], and addressed it to the aforesaid John and Venerius (§ 102, 2). The genuine works of Fulgentius on grace and predestination (De praedestinatione et gratia) are so true an echo of St. Augustine's doctrine, even on such points as the special *voluntas salvifica* of God and the fate of infants deceased without baptism, that he has been rightly called «Augustinus abbreviatus». The golden booklet: De fide seu de regula verae fidei ad Petrum, is a compendium of Catholic doctrine. He wrote also some letters and sermons.

His works were first edited by *W Pirkheimer* and *J. Cochläus,* Hagenau, 1520. The best and most complete edition is that of *L. Mangeant,* Paris, 1684; Venice, 1742 (*Migne,* PL., lxv, Paris, 1847 1861). The De fide ad Petrum is reprinted by *Hurter,* in vol. xvi of his SS. Patr. opusc. selecta; eighteen Epistolae (1—18) are ib., in vols. xlv—xlvi, together with the Vita Fulgentii. The latter work was translated into German by *A. Mally,* Vienna, 1885; cf. *G. Ficker,* in Zeitschr. für Kirchengesch. (1901), xxi. 9—42. In the Rhein. Museum (1899), liv. 111—134, *R. Helm* maintains the identity of our Fulgentius with the profane writer Fabius Planciades Fulgentius; cf. *Teuffel-Schwabe,* Gesch. der röm. Lit., 5. ed., pp. 1238 ff. For a circumstantial and exhaustive study on Fulgentius see *Fessler-Jungmann,* Instit. Patrol., ii 2, 398—432, and *F. Wörter,* Zur Dogmengeschichte des Semipelagianismus (III. Die Lehre des Fulgentius von Ruspe), Münster, 1900 (Kirchengeschichtl. Studien, v. 2). — Of Fulgentius Ferrandus, a disciple and perhaps a relative of Fulgentius of Ruspe, we know only that he was the companion of the latter during his exile in Sardinia and that in 523 he became a deacon of the Church of Carthage. Facundus of Hermiane, who was composing his Pro defensione trium capitulorum in 546, speaks in that work (iv. 3) of Ferrandus as if he were already dead. Apart from the Vita Fulgentii, Ferrandus left some letters and a Breviatio canonum. The latter work (*Migne,* PL., lxvii. 949—962) is a complete rule of ecclesiastical life compiled from Greek and African canons; it treats of bishops (cc. 1—84), of priests (cc. 85—103), of deacons (cc. 104—120), of other ecclesiastics (cc. 121—142), of councils (cc. 143—144), of canonical offences, and among other things of procedure against heretics, Jews and pagans (cc. 145—198), of baptism (cc. 199—205), of Lent (cc. 206—210), and of other miscellaneous points (cc. 211—232). On its literary history cf. *Fr. Maassen,* Geschichte der Quellen und der Literatur des kanonischen Rechts, Graz, 1870, i. 799—802. Seven theological letters of Ferrandus are in *Migne* (l. c., lxvii. 887—950); two of his letters to Fulgentius are among the works of the latter (Ib., lxv. 378—380 392—394). One of these seven letters, addressed to Eugippius (§ 114, 4) was first edited in its entirety by *Mai* (Script. vet. nova Coll., iii 2, 169—184); the only fragment hitherto known was in *Migne* (l. c., lxvii. 908—910), who took it from *Gallandi,* Bibl. vet. Patr., xi. 355. The same Codex Casinas, saec. xi, from which Mai obtained his material, furnished *A. Reifferscheid,* Anecdota Casinensia (Supplement to the Index scholarum in universit. litt. Vratislaviensi per hiemem a. 1871—1872 habendarum) pp. 5—7, with the text of five other hitherto unedited letters of Fulgentius, short personal notes of little importance.

6. DRACONTIUS. — Toward the end of the fifth century a Christian poet again appeared in Africa, Blossius Aemilius Dracontius.

[1] Ep. 15.

He belonged to a wealthy family of the landed gentry, and received the liberal education in grammar and rhetoric suited to his rank and the legal career to which he devoted himself. Both he and his family incurred the wrath of king Gunthamund (484—496) whereby the fortunes of the family were ruined. Dracontius was stripped of all his wealth and cast into prison. He tells us himself, in the *Satisfactio* (vv. 93—94; cf. vv. 105—106), that his misfortunes were owing to a poem in which he had sung the praises of a foreign master (probably the Roman emperor) instead of the Vandal lords of Africa. While in prison, Dracontius composed his Satisfactio, an elegy in one hundred and fifty-eight distichs or three hundred and sixteen hexameters, in praise of God's love and goodness; he also exhorts king Gunthamund to imitate the forgiving spirit and mercy of God, an advice that was unheeded. This poem was followed by a longer one entitled *Laudes Dei,* likewise in honor of the divine graciousness (pietas). It is divided into three books. The first (seven hundred and fifty-four verses) glorifies the loving kindness of God in the Creation; the second (eight hundred and eight verses in the Arevalo, eight hundred and thirteen in the Gläser edition) treats of its continuance and perfection in the preservation of the world and especially in the mission of Jesus Christ; the third (six hundred and eighty-two verses in the Arevalo, six hundred and ninety-nine in the Gläser edition) invites all Christians to repay the divine love by an invincible confidence in God. It is not known if this work of Dracontius met with better success than the former. The remainder of his life is still hidden in obscurity. The didactic gravity of these poems is varied by their strongly subjective and lyrical tone; they exhibit at once a pleasing originality and strong personal emotion. There are extant also some miscellaneous poems of a profane character, most of which were very probably written at an earlier period of the poet's life.

The Satisfactio of Dracontius underwent a substantial revision at the hands of Eugenius II., bishop of Toledo, in keeping with the wishes of the Visigothic king Chindaswinth (642—649); not only were the poetical form and the theology of the poem affected by this treatment, but probably also its political sentiments. It is this revision that was usually printed as Dracontii Elegia (*Migne,* PL., lxxxvii. 383—388), until the edition of *F. Arevalo* (Rome, 1791, pp. 367—402: Ib., lx. 901—932) made known the original text. For a new collation of the manuscripts of Arevalo cf. *F. de Duhn,* Dracontii carmina minora, Leipzig, 1873, pp. 80—90. The Laudes Dei were first edited, with approximate completeness, by *Arevalo,* l. c., pp. 117—366 (Ib., lx. 679—902). The last two books of this poem were edited anew (Breslav, 1843 1847) by *C. E. Gläser,* in two short programs of the Royal Friedrichs-Gymnasium. For the text-criticism of Dracontius scholars are much indebted to *W. Mayer,* Die Berliner «Centones» der «Laudes Dei» des Dracontius, in Sitzungsberichte der kgl. preuß. Akad. der Wissensch. zu Berlin (1890), pp. 257—296. Cf. *F. B.*

*Pitra,* Analecta sacra et classica, Paris, 1888, part I, pp. 176—180. That part of the Laudes Dei which treats of the creation and original sin, i. e. the first book from verse 116 to the end of this book, was soon circulated separately, under the title Hexaemeron creationis mundi (*Isid. Hisp.*, De viris ill., c. 24). Bishop Eugenius also edited anew this section of the poem, and entitled it: Dracontii Hexaemeron; as such it went through various editions (Ib., lxxxvii. 371—384 388). For the profane poems of Dracontius, particularly the Orestis tragoedia, attributed to him with seemingly good reasons, cf. *Teuffel-Schwabe,* Gesch. der röm. Lit., 5. ed., pp. 1220—1224, where the reader will also find the most recent literature, and in particular that concerning the Orestis tragoedia of Dracontius. *J. Gamber,* Le livre de la Genèse dans la poésie latine au V^e^ siècle, Paris, 1899. *H. Malfait,* De Dracontii poetae lingua (Thèse), Paris, 1902. — The aforesaid bishop Eugenius II. of Toledo (646—657) left a number of small poems (Ib., lxxxvii. 359—368 389—400) and some letters (Ib., lxxxvii. 403 to 418). Cf. *Fr. Vollmer,* in Neues Archiv der Gesellsch. für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde (1901), xxvi. 391—404.

### § 114. Italian writers.

1. POPES, ESPECIALLY ST. GELASIUS I. — Among the Popes of the second half of the fifth century, Hilary (461—468), Simplicius (468—483), Felix III. (483—492), Gelasius I. (492—496), Anastasius II. (496—498), it is Gelasius who has left us by far the greater number of important letters and decrees. Some years ago, a not unimportant addition was made to their number by the discovery of ancient papal letters, known as the British Collection, because found in a manuscript belonging to the British Museum. The most famous of the official documents current under the name of Gelasius is the: Decretum de recipiendis et non recipiendis libris, a series of decrees said to have been issued by him at a Roman Synod; modern researches have shown that it is a spurious compilation. In its traditional form this Decretum is made up of five parts: de Spiritu Sancto, de canone Scripturae Sacrae, de sedibus patriarchalibus, de synodis oecumenicis, de libris recipiendis. The fifth part has given the name to the whole work, probably because it is by far the most extensive of the five works: it is a catalogue of libri recipiendi (works of the Fathers) and libri apocryphi qui non recipiuntur (biblical apocrypha and some patristic writings). The ecclesiastical interest of the work is very great, since it is the earliest Index librorum prohibitorum. It was well-known for a long time that the first two parts belonged to a Roman synod held under Pope Damasus, very probably in the year 382. The Gelasian authorship of the latter part has provoked so many objections that it seems more prudent entirely to abandon the defence of it, than to maintain any hypothesis of interpolation and text-corruption. In his edition of the letters of Gelasius (1868), Thiel, following the manuscript-tradition, set aside six of the longer documents among the Epistolae et decreta, and edited them as a special group of Gelasian writings under the title *Tractatus.* Most of them re-

present the sustained but hopeless attempts of the pope to put an end to the Acacian Schism at Constantinople (§ 99, 4). These tractatus are as follows: Gesta de nomine Acacii vel breviculus historiae Eutychianistarum; De damnatione nominum Petri et Acacii; De duabus naturis in Christo adversus Eutychen et Nestorium; Tomus de anathematis vinculo; Dicta adversus Pelagianam haeresim; Adversus Andromachum senatorem ceterosque Romanos, qui Lupercalia secundum morem pristinum colenda constituebant. Other writings of Gelasius have perished. The *Sacramentarium Gelasianum*, or collection of prayers at Mass (§ 97, 2), is declared by Duchesne (1889) to be a compilation of Gregory the Great; Probst (1892) maintains the authorship of Gelasius. Even in the latter hypothesis, additions and modifications may be admitted, since none of the extant manuscripts is prior to the seventh or eigth century It seems quite certain that there existed in the Roman Church previous to Gregory the Great an official collection of such prayers, also that this collection, with its later accretions, lies embedded in the Sacramentarium Gelasianum. On the other hand, such critics as Dom Bäumer think that the time has not yet come when a positive decision can be reached as to the authorship and proper title of the Gelasian Sacramentary in its present shape. — Pope Symmachus (498—514) left some ten genuine letters. Many more letters of his successor, Pope Hormisdas (514 to 523), have survived; it is surmised that the ancient collectors of papal decretals had direct access to the archives of the Roman Church for the correspondence of Hormisdas.

Epistolae et decreta S. Hilari P., in *Migne*, PL., lviii. 11 ff.; S. Simplicii P.: ib., lviii. 35 ff.; S. Felicis P III.: ib., lviii. 893 ff.; S. Gelasii P. I. ib., lix. 13 ff. (letters of Anastasius II. are lacking); S. Symachi P.: ib., lxii. 49 ff.; S. Hormisdae P.: ib., lxiii. 367 ff. A new (unfinished) edition of the early papal letters was begun by *A. Thiel*, Epistolae Romanorum Pontificum genuinae et quae ad eos scriptae sunt a S. Hilaro usque ad Pelagium II., rec. et ed. *A. Thiel*, I: A S. Hilaro usque ad S. Hormisdam a. 461—523, Brunsberg, 1886 (the second volume of this work, though promised, was never published). Many letters of the aforesaid popes have reached us only through the Collectio Avellana (see no. 7). For the new, mostly very brief, letters of Gelasius taken from the British Museum manuscript cf. *S. Loewenfeld*, Epistolae Pontificum Rom. ineditae, Leipzig, 1885, pp. 1—12, also *P. Ewald*, Die Papstbriefe der Britischen Sammlung, in Neues Archiv der Gesellschaft f. ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde (1880), v. 275—414 503—596. The letters of Popes Hilary, Simplicius, Felix III., Gelasius I and Anastasius II. were translated into German by *S. Wenzlowsky*, Die Briefe der Päpste (Bibl. der Kirchenväter), Kempten, 1879—1880, vi—vii. For the chronology of the papal letters from Hilary to Hormisdas see *Jaffé*, Reg. Pontif. Rom. (1885), 2. ed., i. 75—109, also *O. Günther*, Avellana-Studien (Sitzungsberichte of Vienna Academy), Vienna, 1896. The letter of Gelasius (Jan. 25., 494) to Rusticus, bishop of Lyons (*Thiel*, Ep. Rom. Pontif., p. 359), the letter of congratulation written by Anastasius II. to Clovis in 497 (*Thiel*, p. 624), and the letter of Symmachus (Oct. 13., 501) to Avitus of Vienne (*Thiel*, pp. 656 f.) are for-

geries of Jérôme Vignier, according to *Julien Havet* (§ 112, 5). The letter of Anastasius to Clovis is defended by *B. Hasenstab*, Studien zu Ennodius, Munich, 1890, pp. 52 ff. — A separate edition of the decretal De recipiendis et non recipiendis libris was published by *A. Thiel*, Brunsberg, 1866. *J. Friedrich*, Über die Unechtheit der Dekretale «De recipiendis et non recipiendis libris» des Papstes Gelasius I., in Sitzungsberichte d. kgl. bayer. Akad. d. Wissensch. zu München, philos.-philolog. and hist. series (1888), i. 54—86; *Th. Zahn*, Gesch. des neutestamentl. Kanons (1890), ii 1, 259—267; *A. Koch*, Der hl. Faustus, Bischof von Riez, Stuttgart, 1895, pp. 57—71. Cf. § 88, 6. *J. Hilgers*, Der Index der verbotenen Bücher, Freiburg, 1904 1907. The Sacramentarium Gelasianum is in *Migne*, PL., lxxiv. 1055—1244. A new edition is owing to *H. Wilson*, The Gelasian Sacramentary, Liber sacramentorum Romanae ecclesiae, edited by *H. A. Wilson*, Oxford, 1894. *P. de Puniet*, Les trois homélies catéchétiques du sacramentaire gélasien. Pour la tradition des évangiles, du symbole et de l'oraison dominicale. I: «L'Expositio Evangeliorum»; II: «L'Expositio Symboli»; III: «L'Expositio Orationis dominicae», in Rev. d'hist. ecclés. (1904), pp. 505—521 755—786; (1905), pp. 15—32. For further details concerning this work see the writings of *Duchesne* and *Probst* (§ 97, 3), also *S. Bäumer*, in Hist. Jahrb. (1893), xiv. 241—301, and *F. Plaine*, Le sacramentaire gélasien et son authenticité substantielle, Paris, 1896; *Id.*, De Sacramentarii Gelasiani substantiali integritate, in Studien und Mitteilungen aus dem Benediktiner- und Cisterzienserorden (1901), xxii. 131—147 381—389 577—588. *A. Roux*, Le pape Gélase I. (482—496), Paris, 1880. *E. Wölfflin*, in Archiv für latein. Lexikogr. und Gramm. (1900), xii 1, 1—10. *J. Rohr*, Gelasius I. und der Primat, in Theol. Quartalschr. (1902), lxxxiv. 110—123. Other details concerning these popes may be found in *H. Grisar*, Geschichte Roms und der Päpste im Mittelalter, Freiburg i. Br., 1901, i, passim, also in the shorter form of the same work: Roma alla fine del mondo antico, parts I and II, Rome, 1899.

2. ENNODIUS OF PAVIA. — Magnus Felix Ennodius was a native of Southern Gaul, but came at an early age to Northern Italy. He was very probably a teacher of rhetoric before he received the priesthood, and at the time of his ordination his bride became a nun. He was raised to the see of Ticinum (Pavia), apparently in 513, and as such was twice sent (515 and 517) by Pope Hormisdas to the emperor Anastasius in the hope of bringing about the union of the Latin and Greek Churches, separated since the beginning of the Acacian Schism. He died in 521 at Pavia. Ennodius recalls the figure of Apollinaris Sidonius (§ 112, 2); like him Ennodius is at once rhetorician and bishop, prose-writer and poet. His writings, however, exhibit in a more pronounced degree the Christian and ecclesiastical elements of contemporary life; he was also a zealous defender of the papal primacy. In Sirmond's edition of his writings (1611) they are divided into four groups: Epistolae, Opuscula, Dictiones, Carmina. This division is not taken from the manuscripts which contain no division into groups, but present the writings of Ennodius without any order whatever. His *Epistolae* number two hundred and ninety-seven, and were arranged by Sirmond in nine

books. They were all written before 513, very probably at Milan, while Ennodius was still a deacon; in general they are characterized by poverty of thought and magniloquence of diction. His ten *Opuscula miscella* awaken a stronger interest. Chief among them is his panegyric on Theodoric, the Ostrogothic king; it is extremely bombastic in style and ultra-flattering in contents, but exhibits much ability on the part of the writer, and ranks among the principal sources of information on the life of Theodoric. It was delivered in 507 or 508, probably on the festivity kept in honor of some political event, but it is not true, as is usually stated, that our author pronounced this panegyric as an act of gratitude for the services of Theodoric in silencing the antipope Laurentius. Nevertheless, Ennodius had already been, several years before, a champion of the rights of the legitimate pope. The charges against pope Symmachus had been rejected by a Roman synod in 502, the accusers of the pope continued to complain of this action, and published an attack on the synod entitled: Adversus synodum absolutionis incongruae, i. e. against the improper or unbecoming conduct of the synodal fathers in absolving Symmachus. Ennodius refuted this libel and defended the synod with skill and success in his: Libellus adversus eos qui contra synodum scribere praesumpserunt. Other Opuscula are entitled: Vita S. Epiphanii episcopi Ticinensis, a celebrated predecessor of the author in the see of Pavia († 496), written about 503; Vita S. Antonii monachi Lerinensis; Eucharisticum de vita sua (a title, assigned this work by Sirmond in imitation of a similar poem of Paulinus of Pella, § 112, 3): it is a short autobiography of the poet in the shape of a prayer and is modelled on the confessions of St. Augustine; Paraenesis didascalica (also a title of Sirmond), a kind of manual of pedagogy, composed in 511 at the request of his friends Ambrosius and Beatus. The (twenty-eight) *Dictiones* offer a strange mixture of sacred and profane elements. They are mostly models of rhetorical exercises on themes taken from the pagan past of Rome or from ancient mythology. Finally, the *Carmina* of Ennodius were divided by Sirmond into two books, the first of which includes twenty-one short carmina, and the second exhibits one hundred and fifty-one brief epigrammatic inscriptions for sepulchres, churches, images and other works of art. No spark of poetic fire shines in either of the two books.

The edition of *Sirmond* was published at Paris, 1611 (reprinted in *Migne*, PL., lxiii. 13—364). New complete editions were undertaken by *W. Hartel*, Vienna, 1882 (Corpus script. eccles. lat., vi), and *Fr. Vogel*, Berlin, 1885 (Monum. Germ. hist. Auct. antiquiss., vii). *Hartel* preserves the order and division of *Sirmond*, while *Vogel* rejects both and follows the manuscripts. Cf. *Vogel*, Chronologische Untersuchungen zu Ennodius, in Neues Archiv der Gesellsch. für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde (1898), xxiii. 51—74. On the panegyric on Theodoric see *C. Cipolla*, Intorno al panegirico di

Ennodio per re Teoderico, Padova, 1889, reprinted with two other studies, and entitled Del «Panegyricus» di Ennodio in lode di re Teoderico, in Per la storia d'Italia e dei suoi conquistatori, Bologna, 1895, pp. 527—573. *Cipolla* maintains against *Hasenstab* that the panegyric was written, not delivered orally. *M. Dumoulin,* Le gouvernement de Théodoric et la domination des Ostrogoths en Italie d'après les œuvres d'Ennodius, in Revue historique (1902), lxxviii. 1—7 241—265; (1903), lxxix. 1—22. *H. Laufenberg,* Der historische Wert des Panegyricus des Bischofs Ennodius (Diss.), Rostock, 1902. The Apology for the Synod of 502 is discussed by *St. Léglise,* St. Ennodius et la suprématie pontificale au VI^e^ siècle (499 to 503), Lyons, 1890. *P. Rasi,* Dell' arte metrica di Magno Felice Ennodio, vescovo di Pavia, in Bollettino della Società Pavese di Storia (1902), ii. 87—140; *Id.,* Saggio di alcune particolarità nei distici di S. Ennodio, in Rendiconti del r. Istit. Lombardo di scienze e lettere, ii. Series (1902), xxxv. 335—353. *A. Dubois,* La latinité d'Ennodius. Contribution à l'étude du latin littéraire à la fin de l'empire romain d'Occident (Thèse), Paris, 1903. On Ennodius in general cf. *M. Fertig,* M. F. Ennodius und seine Zeit, i, Passau, 1855; ii, Landshut, 1860 (Progr.), iii, ib., 1858. *Fr. Magani,* Ennodio, Pavia, 1886, 3 vols. *B. Hasenstab,* Studien zu Ennodius (Progr.), Munich, 1890. — Between 503 and 506, Ennodius, then a deacon of Milan, delivered an Eulogium on Laurentius, bishop of that city (490—512), on the occasion of the anniversary of his consecration: Dictio in natale Laurentii Mediolanensis episcopi (Enn. op. rec. *Vogel,* pp. 1—4). Several writers see in this Laurentius the Laurentius Mellifluus, about whom Sigebert of Gembloux (De viris ill., c. 120) writes: Scripsit librum de duobus temporibus (id est uno ab Adam usque ad Christum, altero a Christo usque ad finem saeculi); declamavit etiam homilias ore quasi mellito, unde agnominatur mellifluus. Others seek this Laurentius in a contemporary bishop Laurentius of Novara, whose historical existence seems very doubtful. He is not mentioned by *F. Savio,* Gli antichi vescovi d'Italia (Piemonte), Torino, 1899. This De duobus temporibus is also found under the title Homilia de poenitentia, and with two other homilies De eleemosyna and De muliere Chananaea, in *Migne,* PL., lxvi. 89—124. — A panegyric on Christ in one hundred and forty-nine good hexameters entitled De Christi Iesu beneficiis has reached us under the name of Rusticus Helpidius (Elpidius; Ib., lxii. 545 to 548), also a collection of twenty-four epigrams of three verses each, inscriptions for biblical paintings, entitled In historiam testamenti veteris et novi carmina (Ib., lxii. 543—546). New editions of the aforesaid Carmen on our Lord were prepared by *H. Müller,* Göttingen, 1868, and by *W. Brandes,* Brunswick, 1890 (Progr.). According to Ebert (Allgem. Geschichte der Lit. des Mittelalters, 2. ed., i. 414 ff.), Rusticus Elpidius is identical with the deacon Helpidius, physician of king Theodoric, and highly praised by Ennodius. Others see the poet in Flavius Rusticius Helpidius Domnulus, known from his signature in manuscripts, and supposed to be identical with Domnulus the poet-friend of Sidonius Apollinaris (§ 112, 2). *Brandes* (in his edition of the poem) and *Manitius* (Gesch. der christl.-latein. Poesie, Stuttgart, 1891, 380 ff.) maintain that the poet is neither the deacon Helpidius nor the Gallic writer Domnulus, but a descendant of the Italian Flavii Rusticii in the first half of the sixth century. In the Rhein. Museum für Philologie, new series (1876), xxxi. 94, note 1, *E. Bährens* made known four distichs in praise of the De Trinitate of St. Augustine, entitled Versus Rustici defensoris S. Augustini *P. Rasi,* Di alcune particolarità, nel metro eroico e lirico di S. Ennodio, Milano, 1904. — The poet Arator, left an orphan in childhood, adopted by Laurentius, the above mentioned bishop of Milan, later on found a protector in

Ennodius and became a subdeacon of the Roman Church under Pope Vigilius (537—555), and as such put the Acts of the Apostles into Latin hexameters: De actibus apostolorum libri ii (Ib., lxviii. 63—246). This epic dedicated to Pope Vigilius, was shortly afterwards (544) read publicly in the Church of S. Petri ad vincula, at the request of the learned circles of Rome. Arator took Sedulius (§ 91, 5) for his model, and surpassed him in the use of the allegorico-mystical method of interpretation (typica ratio) of the biblical text; on the other hand, he did not attain the elegance and vigor of style that belong to his model. The Epistola ad Parthenium in distichs (Ib., lxviii. 245—252) was sent by Arator to a friend of his youth together with a copy of his poem. A new edition of both was made by *A. Hübner,* Nice, 1850. Cf. *C. L. Leimbach,* Über den Dichter Arator, in Theol. Studien und Kritiken (1873), xlvi. 225—270.

3. DIONYSIUS EXIGUUS. — Dionysius called «the Little» (Exiguus), not on account of his stature, but because of his voluntary choice of that humble title, was a Scythian by birth. He repaired to Rome at an early age, about 500, and lived there as a monk until about 540. We are indebted to the warm eulogy of his friend Cassiodorius[1] for such knowledge of his life as we possess. His chief literary merit consists in the services rendered to Latin scholars by his numerous translations of the treasures of Greek ecclesiastical literature. He labored also both as a translator and a collector of the materials of canon law. He published in Latin a collection of the decrees of Greek and Latin Councils, and in two editions. Of the first edition only the preface has survived. The second edition, undoubtedly published in the first decade of the sixth century, has reached us intact. It begins with the so-called Apostolic Canons (§ 75, 8) and comes down to the Council of Chalcedon (451). In the reign of Pope Symmachus (498—514), Dionysius drew up a collection of the papal decretal letters from Siricius († 398) to Anastasius II. († 498). This collection of the papal decretals was afterward united with the second edition of the collection of canons and formed a whole, thenceforth known as the *Dionysiana* (collectio). Each of these canonical collections acquired high authority in the Western Church. At the request of Pope Hormisdas (514—523), Dionysius compiled in Latin another collection of canons, this time only those of the Greek Councils; with the exception of the preface, this work has perished. The name of Dionysius is for ever memorable in the history of Christian chronology: we owe to him the introduction of the Dionysian or Christian era. He insisted with energy on the adoption of the Alexandrine paschal cycle of nineteen years, and in 525 continued for ninety-five years the paschal tables of St. Cyril of Alexandria. On this occasion he rejected, for the first time. the use of the Diocletian era, and began his computation from the birth of Christ. At the same time he miscalculated this date and located

[1] Institutiones, i. 23.

it in the year 754 A. U. C., whereas it took place a few years before toward the end of 749 A. U C. i. e. 5 B. C.

All these collections are printed in *Migne*, PL., lxvii. 9 ff. The first version in *Migne*, the Epistola synodica S. Cyrilli et concilii Alexandrini, of the year 430 (Ib., lxvii. 11—18), is not the work of Dionysius, but of Marius Mercator (§ 77, 9); cf. *Fr. Maassen*, Geschichte der Quellen und der Literatur des kanonischen Rechts, Graz, 1870, i. 132—136. We have already mentioned the version by Dionysius of the work of Gregory of Nyssa on the constitution of man (§ 69, 10; Ib., lxvii. 345—408). The Dionysiana collectio is printed in *Migne* (l. c., lxvii. 139—316. Another version of the Apostolic Canons made by Dionysius was first edited by *C. H. Turner*, Ecclesiae Occidentalis monumenta iuris antiquissima, Oxford, 1899, i. 1—32; *Id.*, Nicaeni concilii praefationes, capitula, symbolum, canones, ib., 1904. For a discussion of the Epistolae duae de ratione paschae (Ib., lxvii. 19—28; the first letter also ib., lxvii. 483—494), the Cyclus decemnovennalis Dionysii (Ib., lxvii. 493—498), and the Argumenta paschalia (Ib., lxvii. 497—508) see *L. Ideler*, Handbuch der mathematischen und technischen Chronologie, Berlin, 1826, ii. 285 ff. Cf. *Maassen*, l. c., pp. 422 to 440 960—965. See *B. M. Lersch*, Einleitung in die Chronologie, Freiburg, 1899. *Ginzel*, Einleitung in die Chronologie, Leipzig, 1907. *Dom Ambrogio Amelli* is of opinion that the Latin collection of documents discovered by him, and pertaining to the Eutychianist controversies, was compiled by Dionysius the Little in the years 530—535. Cf. Spicilegium Casinense complectens Analecta sacra et profana (1893), i. 1—189: Dionysii Exigui nova Collectio pro controversia de uno e Trinitate in carne passo; cf. *A. Amelli*, S. Leone Magno e l'Oriente, Rome, 1882, Montecassino, 1890, and § 97, 3.

4. EUGIPPIUS ABBAS. — Eugippius (Eugipius or Eugepius), a native of Africa and a companion of St. Severinus in the neighborhood of the Danube (Noricum Ripense, between Passau and Vienna), embraced the monastic life about 492 and became abbot of a monastery at Castellum Lucullianum, near Naples. His *Excerpta ex operibus S. Augustini* are an edifying collection of passages selected from various books of St. Augustine, with an ascetic purpose, and dedicated to Proba, a virgo Deo consecrata at Rome. The numerous extant copies of this work are a proof of its mediæval popularity. Modern readers find more pleasure in the perusal of his *Vita S. Severini monachi* (the fatherly friend of Eugippius, whose death occurred in 482 at Favianis (now Mauer near Oeling on the Danube). The trustworthy and picturesque characteristics of land and people with which this biography abounds, throw a meteor-like light across the historical darkness of these decades. Eugippius left also a letter to the Roman deacon Paschasius (§ 111, 2).

For the writings of Eugippius see *Migne*, PL., lxii. 559—1088 1167 to 1200. A new edition was brought out by *P. Knöll*, Vienna, 1885 – 1886 (Corpus script. eccles. lat., ix. 1—2). The Vita S. Severini has been often edited separately; the best editions (together with the letter concerning this Vita) are those of *H. Sauppe*, Berlin, 1877 (Monum. Germ. hist. Auct. Antiquiss., i. 2); and *Th. Mommsen*, Berlin, 1898. Cf. *Mommsen*, in Hermes

(1897), xxxii. 454—468. It has been often translated into German, e. g. by *K. Rodenberg,* Berlin, 1878, Leipzig, 1884 (Die Geschichtsschreiber der deutschen Vorzeit), and *S. Brunner,* Vienna, 1879. Cf. *Wattenbach,* Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen im Mittelalter, 6. ed., i. 44—51.

5. BENEDICT OF NURSIA. — St. Benedict was born in 480 at Nursia (Norcia in Umbria) and died in 543 in his monastery of Monte Cassino. He composed about 529 the monastic rule that bears his name. The surviving manuscripts are divided into two families. According to the researches of Traube, three manuscripts of the ninth century (codices of St. Gall, Vienna, and Munich) represent the original text as taken from the autograph of the Saint, while all other manuscripts, even those older than the above, represent a longer text viz. the rule as interpolated by Simplicius, the disciple of St. Benedict. Its centralized and comprehensive organisation of the entire monastic life, and its hearty approval by the great popes of the succeeding period, assured to this document the final victory over all other Western rules; from the eighth century to the beginning of the thirteenth it was almost the only monastic rule in the Latin Church. It lifted monasticism to its highest level, and served innumerable holy souls as a guide and mentor in the way of perfection.

*Migne,* PL., lxvi. 215—932: S. P. Benedicti Regula, cum commentariis; 933—934. S. P. Benedicti sermo habitus in discessu S. Mauri et sociorum, epistola ad S. Maurum missa. *E. Schmidt,* O. S. B., published an edition of the Rule with a copious apparatus of «variant readings», Ratisbon, 1880; also (ib.) without the apparatus criticus. *Dom Schmidt* made also a German version of the Rule (ib., 1891 1893 1902). An Italian version of the «buon secolo» was edited by *E. Lisi,* Florence, 1855. A new edition of the Rule was made by *E. Wölfflin,* Leipzig, 1895; cf. *Id.,* in Sitzungsberichte der kgl. bayer. Akad. der Wissensch., philos.-philolog. and hist. series (1895), pp. 429—454, and in Archiv für latein. Lexikographie und Grammatik (1896), ix. 493—521. Regulae S. Benedicti traditio codicum mss. Casinensium a praestantissimo teste usque repetita codice Sangallensi 914 nunc primum omnibus numeris expresso cura et studio monachorum in archicoenobio Casinensi degentium, Montecassino, 1900. *L. Traube,* Textgeschichte der «Regula S. Benedicti», Munich, 1898, in Abhandlungen der kgl. bayer. Akad. der Wissensch. *E. C. Butler,* The text of St. Benedict's Rule (1899), in Downside Review; *Id.,* The Montecassino text of St. Benedict's Rule, in Journal of Theol. Studies (1901 to 1902), iii. 458—468 (against Traube); cf. *J. Chapman,* in Revue Bénédictine (1902), xix. 314—317. *H. Plenkers,* Neuere Arbeiten und Streitfragen über die Benediktinerregel (for Traube), Vienna, 1902, in Zeitschr. für die österreich. Gymn. (1902), liii. 97—115, and *E. Schmidt,* in Studien und Mitteilungen aus dem Benediktiner- und dem Cistercienserorden (1902), xxiii. 363—372 (against Plenkers). Cf. *Id.,* ib. (1903), xxiv. 18—33. *H. Plenkers,* Untersuchungen zur Überlieferungsgeschichte der ältesten lateinischen Mönchsregeln (Munich, 1906), in Quellen und Untersuchungen zur lateinischen Philologie des Mittelalters, i. 3. *J. Besse,* St. Benoit de Nursie, in Dict. de la Théologie, ii. 709—717

6. VICTOR OF CAPUA. — Apart from a few fragments, the works of Victor of Capua († 554) have perished. They seem to have dealt chiefly with the interpretation of Scripture. He drew much of his material from the Greek exegetes.

The so-called Evangelicae harmoniae Ammonii Alex. interprete Victore episc. Capuano are in *Migne,* PL., lxviii. 251—358; cf. § 18, 3. For the Fragmenta D. Polycarpi Smyrn. see ib., lxviii. 359—360; cf. § 10, 3. A Fragmentum de cyclo paschali ib., lxviii. 1097—1098. Scholia veterum Patrum (S. Polycarpi, Origenis, S. Basilii M., Diodori Tarsensis etc.) a Victore episc. Capuae collecta, in *Pitra,* Spicilegium Solesmense, Paris, 1852, i. 265—277. An Excerptum e libello reticulo, seu de arca Noe, under the name of Victor, *Migne,* PL., lxviii. 287—289. For additions and corrections see *Pitra,* Analecta sacra et classica, Paris, 1888, part I, pp. 163 to 165. In the Revue Bénédictine (1890), vii. 416—417, *G. Morin* claims for Victor the letter to Constans, bishop of Aquino, that in some manuscripts of the Lectionarius Romanus appears as a letter of St. Jerome (*Migne,* PL., xxx. 501—504).

7 COLLECTIO AVELLANA. — This is the name given by the scholarly Ballerini brothers (1757) to a collection of imperial and papal letters, made very probably in the latter half of the sixth century at Rome, and for private use. The name was however not quite appropriate: we know now that the Codex Avellanus, once the property of the Umbrian monastery S. Crucis in fonte Avellana (now in the Vatican), is not, as the Ballerini believed, the oldest and best witness to the text; it is, like all other manuscripts, a copy of the Codex Vaticanus 3787, saec. xi. in. The contents of the collection range in date from 367 to 553, and are more ecclesiastico-historical than canonical in character; most of the various pieces have been preserved for posterity only through their incorporation in this documentary compilation.

The Avellana was first edited completely by *O. Günther,* Vienna, 1895 to 1898 (Corpus script. eccles. lat., xxxv), cf. *Id.,* Avellanastudien, Vienna, 1896, in the Sitzungsberichte of the Academy of Vienna. — We owe to Apponius, an Italian monk of the sixth century *(Mai)*, a noteworthy commentary on the Canticle of canticles in twelve books. The first six were published in 1538 at Freiburg i. Br., and later in Maxima Bibl. vet. Patrum, Lyons, 1677. xiv. 98—128. *Mai* added, in Spicilegium Romanum, Rome, 1841, v 1, 1—85, the seventh, eighth and part of the ninth books. The entire work was edited by *Bottino* and *Martini:* Apponii scriptoris vetustissimi in Canticum canticorum explanationis libri xii e codice Sessoriano nunc primum vulgantur curantibus *H. B.* et *J. M.,* Rome, 1843. *J. Witte,* Der Kommentar des Apponius zum Hohenliede (Diss.), Erlangen, 1901.

### § 115. Boethius and Cassiodorius.

1. BOETHIUS. — Anicius Manlius Torquatus Severinus Boethius, a descendant of the famous ancient family of the Anicii that had long before embraced Christianity, was born at Rome about 480. Though left an orphan at an early age, he received an excellent education,

particularly in the Greek language and literature. His extraordinary learning and noble descent, as well as his excellent personal qualities, won for him the esteem and good will of the Ostrogothic king Theodoric. In 510 he was made consul, and in 522 he had the happiness of seeing his two youthful sons invested with the same high office. Boethius was destined, however, to experience the cruel vicissitudes of fortune. He had defended, openly and courageously, the Senator Albinus who was accused of entertaining a secret correspondence with the emperor Justin I. In consequence Boethius was himself suspected of treasonable relations with the Byzantine court. He was also accused of magical practices. The friendly relations of Justin and the pope (John I.) filled the mind of the Arian king with suspicion regarding the loyalty of the Roman and Catholic population. In these dispositions he listened to the enemies of his former favorite, who had meanwhile been accused of treason by a servile senate. After languishing for some time in prison at Pavia, he was cruelly put to death between 524 and 526. — At an early period of his life Boethius devoted himself to one great task, the translation and interpretation of the works of Aristotle and the dialogues of Plato, with the intention of demonstrating that in their principal points both systems of philosophy really agreed[1]. He executed but a small part of this grandiose plan. A number of his versions have reached us, among them the Analytica priora and posteriora, the Soph. Elenchi, and the Topica of Aristotle (his commentary on the latter work has perished). There is also extant his version of the Aristotelian (?) work De interpretatione, with two commentaries, one for beginners, the other (more extensive) for advanced students; by reason of its learning and acumen this latter commentary, composed between 507 and 509, is the masterpiece of the author. Other extant philosophical labors of Boethius are: his version of the Categories of Aristotle with a commentary (510), his commentary (before 510) on the version of Porphyry's Isagoge by Marius Victorinus (§ 87, 8), his own version of the Isagoge with a commentary, his: Introductio ad categoricos syllogismos, De categoricis syllogismis, De hypotheticis syllogismis, and De divisione. The work De definitione is erroneously ascribed to Boethius (§ 87, 8). Other works of Boethius are similar in contents, or correlated, e. g. the long but incomplete commentary on the Topica of Cicero, the works: De differentiis topicorum, De institutione musica, De institutione arithmetica, De geometria; the authenticity of the latter work is doubted by some. — During his imprisonment Boethius composed his famous work: Philosophiae consolatio, or: De consolatione philosophiae, in five books. In the first book a majestic female appears to the sorrowful and complaining philosopher; she is Philosophy and

[1] Cf. init. of book 2 of his larger commentary on De interpretatione.

assures him that she has come for the purpose of sharing the burden that he is bearing for her sake. In the second book she proceeds to apply healing remedies to his troubled spirit: hitherto he has lived in the enjoyment of all the favors of fortune, but fortune is essentially something variable; true happiness is found only within ourselves; riches, position, power, are things of no value; the love of fame, in particular, is a great folly At the beginning of the third book the philosopher begs for the application of more powerful remedies, whereupon Philosophy makes known to him that God is the only source of true happiness. He is, indeed, the last end of all things; all things tend towards Him, however unconsciously; He directs all things for the best. The fourth book opens with an objection of Boethius: How can evil be triumphant on earth, if it be really God, and not chance, that governs the world and directs the lives of men? Philosophy explains to him that Providence leads the good man mysteriously towards true happiness, while the good fortune of the wicked man is only apparent; after death he must meet with punishment. Happiness and unhappiness are dependent on personal merit or on the lack thereof; the external changes of fortune are disposed by God after the manner of a physician and with a view to the conditions of health that each soul exhibits. The fifth book instructs Boethius on the nature of chance and on the harmony between the free will of man and the foreknowledge of God. The whole closes with an admonition to detest vice and to love and practise virtue. In concept and execution the writing is an admirable work of literary art. Its diction is always elegant and correct, while the dialogue lends movement and life to the profound considerations of the work; the prose text is interspersed with numerous poems in many metres. Some of these poems are little masterpieces, while all of them serve as pleasant halting-places and relieve the mind from the strain of a close and continuous dialectic. Boethius is an eclectic, of the Platonist or rather Neoplatonist type. Specific Christian thoughts are seemingly absent from this work; the name of Christ does not occur, nor is there any reference to the truths of Christian faith. In modern times many have wondered that in a work composed in the presence of death, or at least in close proximity thereto, a Christian should have called on Philosophy to console him, instead of Theology. It may be said that in the days of Boethius, when there was not question of strictly theological problems, the teachings of an hereditary philosophy were more frequently looked on as a source of consolation than theology. On the other hand, we do not need to believe that this work manifests the entire spiritual life of its author, all his thoughts and his whole faith. When we consider that philosophy was his favorite occupation, we need not wonder that, even amid the gloomy circumstances of his end, he turned to meditation on

its teachings as a source of spiritual comfort and peace. In tone and color the work is undoubtedly Christian; Christian views of the world and life, though not formally set forth, are tacitly maintained; the purity of the author's ethical principles, and particularly the decision and vigor with which they are expounded, show him to be not only a Christian, but one very profoundly convinced of the truth of his faith. — It was, therefore, rash to conclude from the philosophical attitude of the author of the De philosophiae consolatione that he was not a Christian (an opinion entertained in modern times especially by Obbarius), or that he was a Christian merely in name and appearance (as Nitzsch maintained). This false view of the religion of Boethius was the principal reason some critics had for refusing to recognize his authorship of certain theological works. The five treatises in question may be described as an attempt to shape the doctrinal contents of Christian theology on strictly scientific lines, i. e. to create for Christian doctrine a logical setting and framework. The first of these treatises is entitled: De Sancta Trinitate; its six chapters and their prologue deal with the unity of the divine nature in three persons. The second is very short and discusses the relation of the three persons to the divine nature: Utrum Pater et Filius et Spiritus Sanctus de divinitate substantialiter praedicentur. The third is entitled: Quomodo substantiae in eo quod sint bonae sint, cum non sint substantialia bona. The fourth: De fide (De fide christiana, De fide catholica) contains a summary of instruction on the principal points of the Christian religion. The fifth: Liber contra Nestorium et Eutychen, at once the longest and most important of the five treatises, is a polemico-doctrinal attack on Nestorianism and Monophysitism. It is absolutely impossible to maintain that there exists any incompatibility between the fundamental ideas of these treatises and those of the Consolatio. Krieg has shown that, though there is still some reason for doubting the authenticity of the fourth treatise, the evidence of the manuscripts makes it certain that Boethius is the author of the first, second, third, and fifth. Among some extracts from a lost work of Cassiodorius (see no. 4) discovered by Holder and edited by Usener (1877) we read concerning Boethius: Scripsit librum de Sancta Trinitate et capita quaedam dogmatica et librum contra Nestorium. It is a contemporary who speaks and one perfectly well acquainted with the subjects he is describing: he attributes to Boethius two works agreeing in contents and title with the first and fifth of the treatises in question, also other works of a theological character. The fourth treatise is, therefore, the only one the authorship of which is open to question. — Boethius survived in his works in a measure vouchsafed to very few other writers. It was through his philosophical writings and especially through his translation of the Isagoge of Porphyry, and his commentaries on that

work, that the Middle Ages mastered the Aristotelian logic; he may, therefore, be looked on as the founder of mediæval scholasticism. There is manuscript evidence to show that as early as the ninth and tenth centuries his theological treatises found commentators. Some other commentaries, the work of later writers, have been printed, e. g. those of Gilbert de la Porée († 1154) Pseudo-Beda (probably Gottfried of Auxerre, † 1180), and St. Thomas Aquinas. The mediæval influence and diffusion of the Philosophiae consolatio were really extraordinary: it was everywhere looked on as a beloved heirloom of Christian antiquity. Its text found a long series of commentators, from Asser, the teacher of king Alfred at the end of the ninth century, to Murmellius, at the beginning of the sixteenth century Other scholars translated it into their native tongues: Alfred the Great, king of England († 901) into Anglo-Saxon, and Notker Labeo, monk of St. Gall († 1022), into German; it was translated several times into Italian and French. There are also mediæval translations into Greek (one) and Hebrew (one). Finally it found frequent imitators: among these tributes to its fame and influence we may mention three works entitled De consolatione (or consolationibus) theologiae, by the Dominican John of Tambach († 1372), by Matthew of Cracow, bishop of Worms († 1410), and by John Gerson, chancellor of the University of Paris († 1429).

2. LITERATURE ON BOETHIUS. — The works of Boethius, especially the Consolatio, have reached us in many manuscripts, dating from the ninth to the sixteenth century. *G. Schepss,* Handschriftliche Studien zu Boethius «De consolatione philosophiae» (Progr.), Würzburg, 1881; *Id.,* Geschichtliches aus Boethiushandschriften, in Neues Archiv der Gesellsch. f. ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde (1886), xi. 123—140; *Id.,* Zu Boethius, in Commentationes Woelfflinianae, Leipzig, 1891, pp. 275—280. — Complete editions of Boethius appeared at Venice, 1492 1499, and at Basel, 1546 1570. The best and most complete edition is that in *Migne,* PL., lxiii lxiv. — A. M. S. Boetii Commentarii in librum Aristotelis περὶ ἑρμηνείας, rec. *C. Meiser,* Leipzig, 1877—1880, 2 vols. For the works of Boethius on logic see *C. Prantl,* Geschichte der Logik im Abendlande, Leipzig, 1855, i. 679—722, and *Di Giovanni,* Severino Boezio filosofo, Palermo, 1880. His commentaries on the Topica of Cicero are discussed by *Th. Stangl,* Boethiana (Diss. inaug.), Gotha, 1882. A. M. T. S. Boetii De institutione arithmetica libro duo, De institutione musica libri quinque. Accedit Geometria quae fertur Boetii. E libris mss. ed. *G. Friedlein,* Leipzig, 1867 *O. Paul,* Boetius und die griechische Harmonik. Des A. M. S. Boetius fünf Bücher über die Musik aus der lateinischen in die deutsche Sprache übertragen und mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der griechischen Harmonik sachlich erklärt, Leipzig, 1872. *G. Schepss,* Zu den mathematisch-musikalischen Werken des Boethius, in Abhandlungen aus dem Gebiet der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft, W v. Christ dargebracht, Munich, 1891. pp. 107—113. The spurious work De unitate et uno (*Migne,* PL., lxiii. 1075—1078) was edited anew by *P. Correns,* Die dem Boethius fälschlich zugeschriebene Abhandlung des Dominicus Gundisalvi «de unitate», Münster, 1891 (Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters, i. 1). — A. M. S. Boetii De consolatione philosophiae libri quinque. Ad optim.

libr. mss. nondum collatorum fidem rec. et proleg. instr. *Th. Obbarius,* Jena, 1843. A. M. S. Boetii Philosophiae consolationis libri quinque. Accedunt eiusdem atque incertorum opuscula sacra. Rec. *R. Peiper,* Leipzig, 1871. The opuscula sacra (pp. 147—218) are the five theological treatises, of which *Peiper* accepts only the first three as works of Boethius. In the prolegomena *Peiper* discusses such questions as de commentatoribus Consolationis, de sacrorum operum commentatoribus, de interpretibus, de imitatoribus Philosophiae consolationis. The Greek version of the Consolatio was made about the middle of the fourteenth century by the monk Maximus Planudes of Constantinople; its poetical pieces were edited by *C. F. Weber,* Darmstadt, 1832—1833 (cf. *Peiper,* p. lvi); the whole work was edited by *E. A. Bétant,* Geneva, 1871. The Anglo-Saxon version of king Alfred was edited by *W. J. Sedgefield,* London, 1899; the German version of Notker Labeo was edited by *P. Piper,* Die Schriften Notkers und seiner Schule, Freiburg i. Br., 1882—1883, i. *N. Scheid,* Die Weltanschauung des Boethius und sein «Trostbuch», in Stimmen aus Maria-Laach (1890), xxxix. 374—392. *A. Engelbrecht,* Die Consolatio philosophiae des Boethius. Beobachtungen über den Stil des Autors und die Überlieferung seines Werkes (1902), in Sitzungsberichte of the Vienna Academy. On the metrical compositions in the Consolatio cf. *H. Hüttinger,* Studia in Boetii carmina collata, part I (Progr.), Ratisbon, 1900; part II (Progr.), ib., 1902. — The five theological treatises (edited anew by *Peiper,* as stated above) are fully discussed by *G. Bosisio,* Sull' autenticità delle opere teologiche di A. M. T. S. Boezio, Pavia, 1869. *C. Krieg,* Über die theologischen Schriften des Boethius, in Jahresbericht der Görresgesellschaft für 1884, Cologne, 1885, pp. 23—52. *J. Dräseke,* Über die theologischen Schriften des Boethius, in Jahrb. für protest. Theol. (1886), xii. 312—333 (defends their authenticity, against Nitzsch). *K. Künstle,* Eine Bibliothek der Symbole und theologischer Traktate, Mainz, 1900, pp. 51 ff. *E. K. Rand,* Der dem Boethius zugeschriebene Traktat «De fide catholica», untersucht, Leipzig, 1901, in Jahrb. für Philol. (supplem.), xxvi. 405—461. *S. Brandt,* Entstehungszeit und zeitliche Folge der Werke von Boethius, in Philologus (1903), lxii. 141—154 234—275. — In general on the person and writings of Boethius: *J. G. Suttner,* Boethius, der letzte Römer (Progr.), Eichstätt, 1852. *Fr. Nitzsch,* Das System des Boethius und die ihm zugeschriebenen theologischen Schriften, Berlin, 1860. *L. Biraghi,* Boezio, filosofo, teologo, martire a Calvenzano milanese, Milan, 1865. *H. Usener,* Anecdoton Holderi. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte Roms in ostgotischer Zeit (Festschrift), Bonn, 1877, pp. 37—66 Boethius. *G. Bednarz,* De universo orationis colore et syntaxi Boethii, part I (Diss. inaug.), Breslau, 1883; *Id.,* De syntaxi Boethii, part I (Progr.), Strigau, 1892. *A. Hildebrand,* Boethius und seine Stellung zum Christentum, Ratisbon, 1885. *G. Boissier,* Le christianisme de Boèce, in Journal des savants, Paris, 1889. *G. Semeria,* Il cristianesimo di Severino Boezio rivendicato (Thèse), Rome, 1900, from Studi e Docum. di Storia e Diritto, xxi; *C. Cipolla,* Per la storia del processo di Boezio, ib. (1900), xxi. 335—346. *H. F. Stewart,* Boethius, Edinburgh-London, 1891. *P. Godet,* Boèce, in Dict. de Théologie, ii. 919—922.

3. CASSIODORIUS. — Magnus Aurelius Cassiodorius Senator, the contemporary of Boethius, was a man quite different from him in character, as practical and realistic as Boethius was idealist and theoretical. All the literary labors of Cassiodorius were called forth by motives and circumstances external to himself, by far the greater part of his writings were meant to provide for the pressing needs of his time

and generation. Like Boethius, he was a man of extensive erudition, and he was similarly earnest about sharing his knowledge with a large circle of his fellow citizens. The Middle Ages were perhaps more indebted to both these great scholars than were their own contemporaries. Cassiodorius, or, as he was called in his own day, Senator, was born at Scyllacium in Bruttium (Squillace in Calabria), probably about 477. His family was an ancient and honorable one that for three generations had administered the highest public offices. The confidence of Theodoric in the father of Cassiodorius was inherited by his gifted son. He was scarcely twenty when he was named questor and at the same time private secretary to the king, in other words home-secretary for Italy. The usual honors were rapidly conferred upon him; in 514 he was named consul. In the meantime he had displayed an unwonted activity as royal counsellor; he was the soul of the administration of Theodoric. The king's death in 526 did not diminish his loyalty nor his influence. He continued to serve the Ostrogothic kingdom with devotion during the regency of Amalasuntha; he also held exalted positions during the succeeding reigns. About 540 he bade adieu to the Ostrogothic court, and retired to the monastery of Vivarium which he had founded from the resources of his patrimony. There he gave himself up to the spiritual life and to profound study. Though he had passed his sixtieth year when he put on the monastic habit, his new calling was to be far more productive of results than his political career. He took on himself the personal direction of the monks. Among the duties inculcated by the rule he placed not only the exercises of piety but the study of the ecclesiastical sciences. It is to his personal example and the model set up by his rule, that the Western monasteries owe their character of refuges of learning amid the barbarism of the succeeding epoch. He deserves the chief praise for the preservation of both the earlier classical and the Christian literature and for the attitude of the clergy as representatives of learning. Cassiodorius died about 570, in the odor of sanctity. — The earliest of his extant writings is a Chronicle from Adam to 519, the year of its composition. It is not so much a universal history as a consular list attached to an introduction reaching back to the creation of the world. Its materials are drawn from earlier chronicles; from 496 it seems to be based on personal knowledge of the author. The work is dedicated to Eutharic, son-in-law of Theodoric, husband of Amalasuntha, and consul for the West in 519. It was written with the avowed purpose of reconciling the Roman population to their foreign masters. The same purpose moved him to compose a more extensive and important work, his History of the Goths: De origine actibusque Getarum, in twelve books; this work was continued, apparently, to the death of Theodoric (526) and was published

between 526 and 533. There is reason to regret that the original text has perished, and that we know it only through the cursory and unskilful compendium made in 551 by the Goth (Alan) Jordanis. He wrote panegyrics on the kings and queens of the Ostrogoths, but they have perished, with the exception of a few fragments. Great historical interest attaches to his: Variae (sc. epistolae), a collection in twelve books of the official documents that issued from his chancery. It was published between 534 and 538. The first five books contain rescripts made out in the name of Theodoric, the next two exhibit formulae of nomination to various offices of state, three others present the text of letters and orders sent out in the name of Athalaric, Theodahad, and Witiges, while the last two contain documents issued in the name of Cassiodorius himself as *praefectus praetorio*. This work served as a model to all the early mediæval chanceries; their work is formed upon its style. The frequent disquisitions of all kinds that are met with in these formulae lend a certain color and freshness to otherwise dry and barren ordinances; they were added, to some extent, after the completion of the collection. The Variae were followed by the *De anima*, a summary of very extensive philosophical reading, and showing in a marked way the influence of St. Augustine and Claudianus Mamertus. In this work he gives frequent expression to his preference for a contemplative existence; it may be looked on, therefore, as the link that binds his secular career to his religious life. — The first work composed by Cassiodorius after his retirement from the world was also the most conducive to the intellectual welfare of succeeding ages. It was entitled: Institutiones divinarum et saecularium lectionum (litterarum), and is divided into two books. The first book may be described as methodology of theological sciences, it indicates, in the manner of a compendium, the ecclesiastical authors who are respectively the safest guides in studies of the kind; in these sciences the foremost place is accorded to Biblical exegesis. The second and much shorter book, usually known as: De artibus ac disciplinis liberalium litterarum, contains brief sketches of the seven liberal arts: grammar, rhetoric, dialectics, arithmetic, music, geometry, and astronomy. In the intention of the author, and according to his express statement, the entire work was meant to supply in some measure, and particularly for the monks of Vivarium, the absence of a theological academy in the West, for the deficiency of which the troubled political conditions were, of course, responsible. The institutiones (begun about 544) became one of the most beloved and serviceable manuals of the mediæval student. Cassiodorius wrote also the voluminous *Complexiones in Psalmos*, commenced before the work just mentioned, but finished at a later date. It is called complexiones = collective explanations, because in this commentary the verses of each Psalm

are taken not individually, but in groups. Like the Institutiones it became in mediæval times a very serviceable ecclesiastical manual, especially of exegesis. Its material is largely drawn from the Enarrationes in Psalmos of St. Augustine, and it emphasizes strongly the allegorical or typical interpretation and the symbolism of numbers. The mediæval world was quite unaware that he had also written: Complexiones in epistolas et acta apostolorum et apocalypsim. On the other hand, his: Historia ecclesiastica tripartita, in twelve books, became the ordinary manual of ecclesiastical history for the entire mediæval period. His share in this work was really secondary: he induced his friend Epiphanius Scholasticus to translate from the Greek the histories of Socrates, Sozomen and Theodoret, which he afterward combined into a single work, wherein now one, now another, of these historians takes up the narrative that is simultaneously completed from the works of the other two. The Historia tripartita undertakes to complete and continue the ecclesiastical history of Eusebius as paraphrased by Rufinus; but both the translator and the redactor performed their task in a perfunctory manner. Several other Latin translations of Greek works were made by Epiphanius and other scholars, at the instigation of Cassiodorius (§ 38, 4; 70, 2; 99, 1). His last work, written, as he tells us himself, in his ninety-third year, is entitled: De orthographia, it is a supplement to the Institutiones, and a loose and unsystematic collection of excerpts from earlier orthographers. Several of his writings have perished, notably a commentary on the Epistle of St. Paul to the Romans in which he refuted the errors of Pelagius. He is also credited, but erroneously, with a commentary on the Canticle of canticles.

4. LITERATURE ON CASSIODORIUS. — The best complete edition of the works of Cassiodorius is that by *J. Garet,* Rouen, 1679 (Venice, 1729), 2 vols. A reprint of this edition is found in *Migne,* PL., lxix—lxx, inclusive of the discoveries of Scipio Maffei and Mai. The latest and most reliable editions of the Chronica are those by *Th. Mommsen,* in Abhandlungen der philol.-histor. Klasse der kgl. sächs. Gesellsch. der Wissensch., Leipzig, 1861, iii. 547—696, and in Chronica minora saec. iv v vi vii, vol. ii (Monum. Germ. hist. Auct. antiquiss.), Berlin, 1894, xi. 109—161. On Mommsen's edition of the compendium of the History of the Goths see no 5; his long-expected edition of the Variae appeared in Mon. Germ. hist. Auct. antiquiss., xii (Berlin, 1894), with a triple appendix: I. Epistulae Theodericianae variae, ed. *Th. Mommsen;* II. Acta synhodorum habitarum Romae a. 499 501 502, ed. *Th. Mommsen;* III. Cassiodori orationum reliquiae, ed. *L. Traube.* Cf. *B. Hasenstab,* Studien zur Variensammlung des Cassiodorius Senator, part I (Progr.), Munich, 1833. The historical writings of Cassiodorius are more particularly described by *W. Wattenbach,* Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen im Mittelalter (6. ed.), i. 65—72, and *C. Cipolla,* Considerazioni sulle «Getica» di Jornandes e sulle loro relazioni colla «historia Getarum» di Cassiodoro Senatore, Turin, 1892. The «De anima» is the subject of a special treatise by *V. Durand,* Quid scripserit de anima M. A. Cassiodorus, Toulouse, 1851. The manuscript-tradition of the second

book of the Institutiones is discussed by *G. Laubmann,* in Sitzungsberichte der kgl. bayer. Akad. der Wissensch. zu München, philos.-philolog. and hist. series (1878), ii. 71—96. The chapter of the second book of the Institutiones devoted to rhetoric was edited by *C. Halm,* Rhetores latini minores, Leipzig, 1863, pp. 493—504. Cf. Cassiodorii De orthographia et De arte grammatica excerpta, in *H. Keil,* Grammatici latini, Leipzig, 1880, vii. 127—216. The text of the Complexiones in Psalmos was emended by *Th. Stangl,* Zu Cassiodorius Senator, in Sitzungsberichte der k. Akad. der Wissensch. zu Wien, philos.-hist. series (1887), cxiv. 405—413. An important excerpt, about a page in length, from a hitherto unknown work of Cassiodorius, and containing a genealogical conspectus of his family with references to his works and those of his relatives (see no. 1), was discovered by *A. Holder,* and edited by *H. Usener,* Anecdoton Holderi, Bonn, 1877. The text (pp. 3—4) of this document is illustrated by an exhaustive commentary of *Usener* (pp. 5—79). — For the history of Cassiodorius in general see *A. Thorbecke,* Cassiodorus Senator (Progr.), Heidelberg, 1867; *A. Franz,* M. A. Cassiodorius Senator (Progr.), Breslau, 1872; *G. Minasi,* M. A. Cassiodoro Senatore, Naples, 1895. Other writings on Cassiodorius are indicated by *A. Potthast,* Bibl. hist. med. aevi, i. 197 f. See also *P. Godet,* Cassiodore, in Dict. de Théologie, ii. 1830–1834.

5. OTHER HISTORIANS. — We have already mentioned (no. 3) the De origine actibusque Getarum of Jordanis, who also wrote (551) De summa temporum vel de origine actibusque gentis Romanorum, a compendium of universal history compiled from such sources as were then available. Jordanis Romana et Getica. Rec. *Th. Mommsen,* in Monum. Germ. hist. Auct. antiquiss., Berlin, 1882, v. 1; cf. *W. Wattenbach,* Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen im Mittelalter, 6. ed., i. 72—79, also *L. v. Ranke,* Weltgeschichte, iv 2 (1.—3. ed.), 313—327. *C. Cipolla,* Considerazioni sulle «Getica» di Jornandes e sulle loro relazioni colla «Historia Getarum» di Cassiodoro Senatore, Turin, 1892. — Jordanis made considerable use of the Chronicle of the Illyrian Marcellinus Comes, covering the years 379—534, but chiefly devoted to the affairs of the earlier Empire (*Migne,* PL., li. 913 ff.). A new edition was brought out by *Mommsen,* Chronica minora saec. iv v vi vii, (Monum. Germ. hist. Auct. antiquiss., 1894, xi) ii. 37 ff. Cf. *Teuffel-Schwabe,* Gesch der röm. Lit., 5. ed., pp. 1253—1254. — Victor of Tunnuna in Northern Africa was a Catholic bishop who suffered much at the hands of Justinian in his defence of the matter of the Three Chapters; he died at Constantinople about 569, probably in a monastery-prison. Victor wrote a Chronicle from the creation to 567; only the latter portion of it has reached us, beginning with 444, and dealing chiefly with the affairs of the African Church (*Migne,* PL., lxviii. 937 ff.); edited anew by *Mommsen,* l. c., pp. 163 ff., cf. *Bähr,* Die christl. Dichter und Geschichtschreiber Roms, 2. ed., p. 218. — John, Abbot of the monastery Biclaro in the foot-hills of the Pyrenees, a Spanish Visigoth, wrote a continuation of the Chronicle of Victor covering the period from 567 to 590; his narrative is impartial and ranks among the most reliable sources of Visigothic history (*Migne,* PL., lxxii. 859 ff.); a new edition by *Mommsen,* l. c., pp. 163 ff.; cf. *F. Görres,* in Theol. Studien u. Kritiken (1895), lxviii. 103—135. — Marius, bishop of Avenches (later of Lausanne, † 593), continued the Chronicle of Prosper of Aquitaine (§ 95, 3) from 455 to 581 (*Migne,* PL., lxxii. 791 ff.); new editions by *W. Arndt,* Leipzig, 1875 1878, and by *Mommsen,* l. c., pp. 225 ff.; cf. *Teuffel-Schwabe,* l. c., pp. 1255. — In his De excidio Britanniae, the Keltic writer Gildas, surnamed Sapiens, drew (560) a gloomy picture of the sad condition of Britain since its conquest by the Romans (*Migne,* PL., lxix. 327 ff.); the latest edition is that by *Mommsen,* l. c. (Monum. Germ.

hist. Auct. antiquiss. xiii, 1898), iii. 1 ff. Cf. *A. de la Borderie,* Etudes historiques bretonnes, I. series: L'historien et le prophète des Bretons, Gildas et Merlin, Paris, 1883. — Brief mention may also be made of certain itineraries to the Holy Land. To the years 520—530 belongs De situ terrae sanctae (edited 1865), written by a certain Theodosius Archidiaconus, probably a native of Northern Africa. The little Breviarius de Hierosolyma, discovered in 1879, belongs probably to the sixth century. They were excellently edited by *J. Gildemeister,* Bonn, 1882. The Itinera Hierosolymitana edited by *Pitra,* Analecta sacra et classica, Paris, 1888, part I, pp. 118—121, and attributed to a certain fifth-century Vigilius (Preface p. viii), are really a portion of the work of Theodosius (*Gildemeister,* pp. 15—21: Revue biblique x. 93—96). — About 570 a certain Antoninus of Piacenza made a journey to the East that was afterward narrated by an unknown companion Antonini Placentini Itinerarium (*Migne,* PL., lxxii. 899—918). A separate edition with a German version was brought out by *J. Gildemeister,* Berlin, 1889; cf. *H. Grisar,* Zur Palästinareise des sog. Antoninus Martyr um 580, in Zeitschr. f. kath. Theol. (1902), xxvi. 760—770. Grisar holds that the Antoninus in question is the holy patron of Piacenza, a third- or fourth-century martyr, and that the journey was merely placed under his protection. The real title of the work should therefore be: Anonymi Placentini Itinerarium; cf. *P. Piacenza,* De itinerario Antonini Placentini, in Ephemerides liturgicae (1903), xvii. 338—348 (in favor of the traditional title) and (the reply of) *Grisar,* in Civiltà Cattolica (1903), series xviii, vol. xi. 600—609. *H. Grisar,* in Zeitschr. für kath. Theol. (1903), xxvii. 776—780; *P. Piacenza,* Iterum de Itinerario Antonini, in Ephem. Liturgiae (1903), xvii. 388—609. *L. Bellanger,* In Antonini Placentini itinerarium grammatica disquisitio (Thèse), Paris, 1902. For all three works cf. *P Geyer,* Itinera Hierosolymitana (Corpus script. eccles. lat. [1898], xxxix. 135—218). *E. Levesque,* in Dict. de la Bible, i. 713 714.

### § 116. Writers in the Three Chapters controversy.

1. FACUNDUS OF HERMIANE. — Facundus, bishop of Hermiane, in the African province of Byzacena, not only withstood the edict of Justinian against the Three Chapters of the year 543 or 544 (§ 102, 3), but wrote a voluminous work in twelve books, entitled: Pro defensione trium capitulorum. It was composed at Constantinople between 546 and 551, or 546—548 according to Dobroklonskji, and presented to the emperor. It is not the Nestorian doctrine, condemned at Ephesus in 431, that Facundus seeks to defend, but the authority of the Council of Chalcedon (451) which he believes to be called in question by the emperor's edict against the Three Chapters. It is the opinion of Facundus, that the latter document implies a condemnation of the Fathers of Chalcedon who uttered no censure against Theodore of Mopsuestia and his writings and formally received into ecclesiastical communion both Theodoret of Cyrus and Ibas of Edessa; moreover, it is wrong, he says, to raise again the question of guilt or innocence, once death has supervened and removed the person implicated. In its last session (June 2., 553), the Council of Constantinople condemned the Three Chapters, and after some hesitation this action was approved of by Pope Vigilius, whereupon Facundus and

most of the bishops of Africa renounced the communion of the Pope and the Oriental bishops. Facundus remained obdurate in his resistance; in reply to suggestions of a conciliatory character he composed (about 571) two polemical treatises: Liber contra Mocianum Scholasticum, and: Epistola fidei catholicae in defensione trium capitulorum.

The works of Facundus are in *Migne,* PL., lxvii. 527—878; cf. *A. Dobroklonskji,* The work of Facundus, bishop of Hermiane: «Pro defensione trium capitulorum», Moscow, 1880 (Russian). — The views of Facundus in his first work, concerning the edict of Justinian, were shared by the Carthaginian deacon Fulgentius Ferrandus (§ 113, 5), in his Epistola ad Pelagium et Anatolium diaconos urbis Romae (*Migne,* PL., lxvii. 921—928), and by the African bishop Pontianus, in his Epistola ad Justinianum imper. (Ib., lxvii. 995—998).

2. POPE VIGILIUS. — The Three Chapters controversy attained an undue celebrity by reason of the personal participation of Pope Vigilius (537—555). He was called by the emperor to Constantinople, and at first condemned energetically the imperial edict against the Three Chapters. Afterwards (April 11., 548) he issued a *Iudicatum* (extant only in fragments) in which he condemned the Three Chapters, but added certain clausulae in order to save the authority of the Council of Chalcedon: Salva in omnibus reverentia synodi Chalcedonensis. Nevertheless, in his *Constitutum* (May 14., 553), Vigilius professed the above-mentioned ideas of Facundus (see no. 1), and refused to anathematize the dead, or to violate in any degree the decisions of the Council of Chalcedon. In the meantime the Council of Constantinople, opened May 5., 553, anathematized in its eighth and last session (June 2.) the Three Chapters, a condemnation to which Vigilius finally gave his assent in two documents, dated Dec. 8., 553, and Febr. 23., 554. Vigilius wrote also several other letters concerning this controversy. Though Vigilius was personally convinced that the Three Chapters merited condemnation, his attitude with regard to them was at all times uncertain, wavering and yielding to external pressure.

Epistolae et decreta Vigilii P (*Migne,* PL., lxix. 15 ff.; also in the collections of the Councils, e. g. *Mansi,* ix; cf. *Jaffé,* Reg. Pontif. Rom., 2. ed. 1885, i. 117—124). *J. Punkes,* Papst Vigilius und der Dreikapitelstreit, Munich, 1864. *Hefele,* Konziliengeschichte, 2. ed., ii. 798—924. In his work: Vigilii Pontificis Romani, Origenis Adamantii, Iustiniani imperatoris triumphus in synodo oecum. v (In S. Gregorii Nysseni et Origenis scripta et doctrinam nova recensio, iv), Rome, 1865, *Al. Vincenzi* entered upon a new line of defence of the character of Pope Vigilius. He maintained that many of the contemporary documents are spurious, notably the Constitutum Vigilii Papae, and thereby exculpated the latter from the charges of vacillation and irresolution. This line of apology met with criticism; cf. *J. Hergenröther,* in Theol. Literaturblatt (1866), pp. 543—551, and *L. Duchesne,* Vigile et Pélage, in Revue des questions historiques (1884), xxxvi. 369—440; (1885), xxxvii. 579—593. *L. Lévêque,* Etude sur

le pape Vigile, in Revue des sciences ecclésiastiques, Amiens, 1887. *H. Grisar,* Geschichte Roms und der Päpste im Mittelalter, Freiburg, 1901, pp. 574 f.; *Id.,* in Roma alla fine del mondo antico, part II, Rome, 1899, pp. 248 f. Cf. Papa Vigilio, in Civiltà Cattolica (1903), series xviii, vol. xii, 5—26, and Il Papa Vigilio (537—555), Studio storico-critico, by *Fedele Savio,* S. J., Rome, 1904 (Scienza e Religione). — With the exception of St. Silverius, the immediate predecessors of Vigilius have left letters of some importance: Epistolae et decreta S. Felicis P. IV (526—530; *Migne,* PL., lxv 11 ff.), to which must be added the now famous Decretum, a very important document for the history of papal elections. Felix designates therein as his own successor the archdeacon Boniface, who actually reigned as Boniface II. (530—532). This document was made known by *Amelli* in 1882, and edited by *Mommsen*, in Neues Archiv für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde (1886), xi. 367; cf. ib. (1885), 412 584, and (1886) 367; *Ewald,* Akten zum Schisma des Jahres 530. It was edited anew by *A. Amelli,* in Spicilegium Casinense (1888), i. 179—180. *Duchesne,* La succession du Pape Félix IV, Rome, 1883. Bonifatii P II. Epistolae (530 to 532: *Migne,* PL., lxv. 31 ff.); Ioannis P II. (532—535: Ib., lxvi. 11 ff.); S. Agapiti P. I. (535—536: Ib., lxvi. 35 ff.); cf. *Jaffé,* l. c., pp. 110—115, and *Grisar,* l. c.

3. POPE PELAGIUS I. — As archdeacon of the Roman Church Pelagius composed at Constantinople (554) a *Refutatorium* of the Council of Constantinople, that is extant in manuscript but has never been printed. This work was withdrawn by him after his elevation to the papal see (555). Though his reign was short († March 3., 560), we possess a relatively large number of his letters, most of them made known for the first time through the lately discovered British Collection of papal letters (§ 114, 1).

The discovery of an incomplete manuscript of the Refutatorium was announced by *L. Duchesne,* in the Bulletin critique (1884), p. 96; cf. *S. Reiter,* Eine unedierte Schrift des Pelagius, in Serta Harteliana, Vienna, 1896, pp. 134—136, also the essay of Duchesne (see no. 2) on Vigilius. The Epistolae Pelagii P I. are in *Migne,* PL., lxix. 393 ff., and in *Mansi,* l. c., ix. For the recently discovered (mostly short) letters see *S. Loewenfeld,* Epistolae Pontificum Rom. ineditae, Leipzig, 1885, pp. 12—21; cf. *Jaffé,* l. c., pp. 124—136. The history of Pelagius is discussed by *H. Grisar,* Geschichte Roms und der Päpste im Mittelalter, Freiburg, 1901, i. 580 f. and passim. Mention is made by *Grisar* (pp. 707—708) of the Latin version of the »Words of the ancient Fathers» (§ 102, 2) made by Pelagius before he became pope, in collaboration with the subdeacon John (*Migne,* PL., lxxiii. 851 f.).

4. RUSTICUS. — This very stubborn defender of the Three Chapters was a deacon of the Roman Church and a nephew of Pope Vigilius, who felt obliged to excommunicate and depose him from his office. In collaboration with Felix, an African abbot, he wrote at Constantinople a polemical work against the Council of Constantinople, it is known to us only through the mention vouchsafed to it by Victor of Tunnuna[1] Rusticus wrote also a work against the

[1] Chron. ad a. 553.

Monophysites: Contra Acephalos disputatio. It is extant, but only in part; it takes the form of a dialogue between the author and a heretic.

The Disputatio is in *Migne,* PL., lxvii. 1167—1254. For a revision of the Latin version of the acts of the Council of Chalcedon undertaken by Rusticus between 549—550 cf. *Hefele,* Konziliengeschichte, 2. ed., ii. 416 ff. Cf. *J. B. Pitra,* Spicil. Solesm., Paris, 1858, iv. 192—221: Rustici S. E. R. diaconi (forte et Verecundi) scholia, distinctiones et collationes in acta Concilii Chalcedonensis. *Pitra* thinks that Rusticus may have composed these scholia in union with Verecundus of Junca (see no. 5).

5. VERECUNDUS OF JUNCA. — Verecundus of Junca, a bishop in the African province of Byzacena, who died in 552 at Chalcedon, was also a determined opponent of the imperial edict against the Three Chapters. His writings were first published by Pitra (1858). They are a series of extracts from the acts of the Council of Chalcedon (Excerptiones de gestis Chalcedonensis concilii), Commentaries on nine Old Testament canticles (Commentariorum super cantica ecclesiastica libri ix), and a Penitential poem (De satisfactione poenitentiae) in two hundred and twelve hexameters (together with Meyer's appendix), deeply Christian in sentiment, but very faulty in grammar and metre.

The writings of Verecundus were first edited by *Pitra,* Spicil. Solesm., Paris, 1858, iv. He published also a second recension of the Excerptiones that is evidently a compendium of the first (pp. 166—185), with some additions of the deacon Liberatus (see no. 6): Verecundi et Liberati diaconi Carthaginiensis Excerptiones e concilio Chalcedonensi (pp. 186—191); see also no. 4. In the Abhandlungen der kgl. bayer. Akad. der Wissensch., I. Klasse, Munich, 1885, xvii 2, 431, *W Meyer* published eight additional verses of the poem De satisfactione poenitentiae (pp. 138—143). Cf. *Manitius,* Gesch. der christl.-latein. Poesie, Stuttgart, 1891, pp. 403 ff. Another well-known poem: Exhortatio poenitendi, attributed to Verecundus by *Pitra* (pp. 132—137), is of more recent origin and is only a fragment of a larger composition; cf. *Meyer,* l. c., pp. 431 ff., and *Manitius,* l. c., pp. 416 ff. The poem De resurrectione et iudicio, attributed to Verecundus by Isidore of Seville (De viris ill., c. 7), is probably identical with the: De iudicio Domini, or De resurrectione mortuorum, printed with the works of Tertullian and Cyprian (§ 50, 8). — More recent in date is the poem entitled Crisias, appended by *Pitra* (pp. 144—165) to the poems of Verecundus, and dealing in three books with the appearance of Antichrist, the general judgment, and the resurrection of the dead.

6. LIBERATUS. — We owe to this writer a not unimportant historical work dealing with the controversy of the Three Chapters, the Breviarium causae Nestorianorum et Eutychianorum, a concise outline of the history of Nestorianism and Monophysitism from the episcopal consecration of Nestorius to the Council of Constantinople (428—553). Liberatus was a deacon of the Church of Carthage and composed his work between 560 and 566; it is somewhat prejudiced in favor of the Three Chapters.

The text of the Breviarium is in *Migne,* PL., lxviii. 969—1052. For earlier editions cf. *Fessler-Jungmann,* Instit. Patr., ii 2, 542, note. See also no. 5.

7 PRIMASIUS OF HADRUMETUM. — This writer also took part in the Three Chapters controversy. He was bishop of Hadrumetum in the province of Byzacena, and left a commentary on the Apocalypse, made up mostly of concise excerpts from earlier Latin commentators. His work on heresies has apparently perished. A commentary on the Epistles of St. Paul is erroneously attributed to him.

For the text of the Commentaries on the Pauline Epistles and the Apocalypse see *Migne,* PL., lxviii. 413—936. Cf. *J. Haussleiter,* Leben und Werke des Bischofs Primasius von Hadrumetum (Progr.), Erlangen, 1887, and *Id.,* Die lateinische Apokalypse der alten Afrikanischen Kirche, in *Th. Zahn,* Forschungen zur Gesch. des neutestamentl. Kanons, Erlangen, 1891, iv. 1—224. The commentary on the Pauline Epistles is an anti-Pelagian revision of the commentary of Pelagius on the same Epistles, and was composed in Southern Gaul about 465—500; cf. *H. Zimmer,* Pelagius in Irland, Berlin, 1901, and *G. Morin,* in Revue Bénédictine (1903), xx. 118.

8. JUNILIUS. — At the urgent request of Primasius of Hadrumetum (see no. 7), Junilius composed his *Instituta regularia divinae legis,* a work formerly known as *De partibus divinae legis,* a title taken from the first chapter of the first book. In its actual shape this work is a methodical introduction to a profound study of the Sacred Scripture. The author draws principally upon the teaching of Paul of Nisibis; at the same time he reproduces in detail the exegetical principles of Theodore of Mopsuestia, as well as his Christology and his teaching concerning the biblical canon. Junilius was born in Africa, but was not a bishop, as is usually asserted; he held a high official position (quaestor sacri palatii) at Constantinople.

This account of Junilius is based on *H. Kihn,* Theodor von Mopsuestia und Junilius Afrikanus als Exegeten, nebst einer kritischen Textausgabe von des letzteren «Instituta regularia divinae legis», Freiburg, 1880 (the text of Junilius appeared also in a separate edition, ib., 1880). On the editio princeps by *J. Gastius,* Basel, 1545, reprinted in *Migne,* PL., lxviii. 15—42, cf. *Kihn* (l. c., pp. 229 ff.), who also treats of Paul of Nisibis (pp. 254 ff.). *G. Mercati,* Per la vita e gli scritti di Paolo il persiano, in Note di letterature biblica e cristiana antica (Studi e Testi, v), Rome, 1901, pp. 180—206. *Kihn* discusses (p. 301) the commentary on the first chapter of Genesis falsely attributed to Junilius. *A. Rahlfs* contributed to the text-criticism of the Instituta, in Nachrichten von der kgl. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen (1891), pp. 242—246. — Cresconius, author of a Concordia canonum, was very probably an African bishop. In this work the greater part of the canons and decretals found in both collections of Dionysius Exiguus (§ 114, 3) is distributed under three hundred and one rubrics, but without any apparent plan or order (*Migne,* PL., lxxxviii. 829 to 942). In the preface to his work Cresconius mentions the Breviatio canonum of Fulgentius Ferrandus (§ 113, 5). Up to the present the only certain terminus ad quem for the life of Cresconius is the earliest (Verona)

manuscript of the Concordia; it belongs to the eighth century. Cf. *Fr. Maassen*, Geschichte der Quellen und der Literatur des kanonischen Rechts, Graz, 1870, i. 806—813.

### § 117. St. Gregory of Tours and Venantius Fortunatus.

1. GREGORY OF TOURS. — St. Gregory of Tours, the historian of the Franks, descended from a very honorable senatorial family of Gaul. He was born probably Nov. 30., 538, in the Urbs Arverna (Clermont-Ferrand) and was originally called Georgius Florentius. Veneration for the holy bishop Gregory of Langres (506/507 to 539/540), the grandfather of his mother Armentaria, induced him, at a later period, to take the name which he was to render famous. After the early death of his father Florentius, Gregory was entrusted to his uncle St. Gallus, bishop of Clermont (546—554) at whose hands he received a religious training. In those youthful days he had already resolved to enter the priestly state. After the death of St. Gallus, he was instructed in the Scriptures by the priest Avitus, afterwards (571—594) bishop of Clermont. In 563 he fell dangerously ill, but was restored to health on the occasion of a pilgrimage to the tomb of St. Martin at Tours. It is possible that on this journey he began the relations which were, ten years later, to bring about his election as bishop of that city He was thirty-five years of age when in 573 he succeeded his maternal relative, Euphronius in the see of Tours. Venantius Fortunatus celebrated his elevation in stately verse[1], expressive at least of a sincere admiration for Gregory; and indeed, the latter did not deceive the expectations of his poet-friend. Amid difficult circumstances Gregory discharged the duties of the pastoral office in a spirit of heroic self-denial; we behold him solicitous not only for the spiritual but also for the temporal welfare of his flock. Amid the frequent hostilities of the time with prudence and energy he ever maintained the interests and honor of the city of Tours. The city of St. Martin was then the religious centre of Gaul; consequently the influence of its bishop radiated far beyond the walls of Tours, and was felt throughout the entire kingdom. This was made evident in 584 when Chilperic, against whose violent measures he had energetically and successfully defended the interests of the Church and civilization, was assassinated, and Tours came (585) under the sceptre of Childebert. Gregory enjoyed the entire confidence of this king, frequently visited his court, and acted more than once as his ambassador in affairs of political importance. When he died (Nov 17., 593 or 594), he possessed the esteem of all the inhabitants of Gaul. — Notwithstanding his very active life, Gregory was an uncommonly industrious and productive writer. It is probable that he entered on this career only after he was made bishop, and

[1] Carm. l. v, c. 3: Ad cives Turonicos de Gregorio episcopo.

that the original impulse came from his veneration for St. Martin. He was deeply conscious of his own shortcomings and began his labors with some hesitation; he knew and confessed that he was lacking in grammatical knowledge, and that his training in the arts of expression was defective. In the preface to the history of the Franks he says that he will speak: incultu (sic) effatu, quia philosophantem rhetorem intellegunt pauci, loquentem rusticum multi. In the introduction to the first book of the same work he bespeaks the forbearance of the reader: si aut in litteris aut in sillabis grammaticam artem excessero, de qua adplene non sum imbutus. In the preface to the *In gloria confessorum* he admits that he confuses the genders and even the cases of substantives, and that he is incapable of properly applying the prepositions: quas nobilium dictatorum observari sanxit auctoritas. Nevertheless his diction is very interesting and worthy of careful study, since it brings before our eyes many features of the transformation-process through which the Latin gradually passed into the Romance, and particularly the French tongue. The writings of Gregory are theological and historical in contents, yet so that the ecclesiastic is always visible in the historian, while his theological writings are markedly historical in character, dealing as they do with the lives of the Saints and particularly of Frankish Saints. As an historian Gregory merits in a high degree our respect and confidence. It is true that he often betrays remarkable credulity and has fallen into numerous errors. The latter he might have avoided, were he less superficial and readier to profit by the resources that were accessible to him. On the other hand, it is now universally admitted that he manifests on all occasions an honest willingness to state the truth impartially and even critically — Gregory has left us a catalogue of his writings[1]: Decem libros historiarum, septem miraculorum, unum de vita patrum scripsi; in psalterii tractatu librum unum commentatus sum; de cursibus etiam ecclesiasticis unum libri condidi. From occasional statements of his own[2] we gather that he compiled a book from the «Masses» (de missis ab eo compositis) of Apollinaris Sidonius, and that, with the help of a Syrian interpreter (Siro quodam interpretante), he translated into Latin the Legend of the Seven Sleepers[3]; the former of which two works has perished (§ 112, 2). It is odd that this translation of the Passio ss. martyrum septem dormientium apud Ephesum should often be set down as a lost work, although it was printed as early as 1476 by Mombrizio (Mombritius). The entire text of the: De cursibus ecclesiasticis was discovered by Haase in a Bamberg manuscript and published in 1853, until then only some short fragments of it were known; the manuscript-title of the work is: De

[1] Hist. Franc., x. 31, ad fin. [2] Ib., ii. 22.
[3] In gloria martyrum, c. 94.

cursu stellarum ratio qualiter ad officium implendum debeat observari. It is a kind of liturgical manual, composed after 575 and before 582, and containing instructions for the distribution of the ecclesiastical «officia» or «lectiones» (cursus ecclesiastici) according to the position, or more particularly, according to the rise of the principal constellations. Only a few sparse fragments of Gregory's commentary on the Psalms have reached us. The Septem libri miraculorum are not one work, as the title might imply, but as many separate compositions, collected and revised by Gregory shortly before his death, and published as an hagiographical corpus, together with his: Liber de vita patrum. The work opens with: In gloria martyrum, written about 590, a narrative of the miracles of Christ, the Apostles, and various martyrs of the Church of Gaul. It is followed by the: De virtutibus (i. e. de miraculis) S. Juliani, written between 581 and 587, an account of the miracles performed at the shrine of Brivate (Brioude) by the intercession of St. Julian, a much venerated Gallic martyr who suffered about 304 in the vicinity of Clermont. The four books De virtutibus S. Martini (iii—vi) are described in the preface as a memorial for posterity of the daily miraculous intercession (praesentes virtutes) of St. Martin. According to Krusch the first book was composed before 576, the second not before 581, the third about 587; the fourth was never finished. Seventh among the writings of Gregory is the: Liber vitae patrum, acknowledged to be the most interesting and important of the works that make up the hagiographical collection. It includes twenty lives of Saints, or rather twenty-three, since in each of three lives two Saints are dealt with simultaneously These lives were originally published separately; some of them were not written before 592. The eighth and last book of this corpus, In gloria confessorum, contains brief accounts of miraculous events; it was finished in 587, but after 590 underwent modification and enlargement. Hagiographical legends are also the subject-matter of his: Liber de miraculis beati Andreae apostoli, and his: Liber de miraculis beati Thomae apostoli, genuine works of Gregory, though not claimed by him in the list of his writings. — Gregory's reputation really rests upon the ten books of his: Historia Francorum. He says expressly, in the preface, that he writes the work in order to hand down to future generations a picture of his own times; hence, from the fifth book inclusive, it assumes in a marked degree the character of personal memoirs to which the first four books furnish a necessary introduction. The first book furnishes a chronological background for his narrative: the history of the world from Adam to the death of St. Martin in 397. In the second book he treats of Chlodwig (Clovis), the founder of the Frankish monarchy. In the third book the history of the Franks is brought down to the death of Theodobert I. († 548), in the fourth as far as Sigibert († 575); at this

point Gregory begins to be in some measure a personal witness and guarantor of the events narrated. These four books were composed, according to Arndt, in 575. The next two books, covering the years 575—584, were written between 580 and 585. The last four books were composed as opportunity offered, they describe at considerable length the events of 584—585, and in a more compendious way the history of the next succeeding years to 591. Gregory himself added to and variously modified the first six books of his History of the Franks. With the fifth book began his personal share and interest in the narrative. Henceforth he is relating the history of his own period; his personal relations to contemporary history are constantly in the foreground. He loves to dwell in a diffuse and circumstantial manner on events and situations in which he was himself concerned. His narrative runs on in a rather weak and rambling way; it is not so much a history as a loose suture of unconnected occurrences. There is no attempt to understand or explain the connexion and genesis of events; the narrator is contented to reveal the bare facts as he knows them. The work is of course alive with that interest which belongs to all that is personal and individual, but apart from this it has always exercised a distinct and peculiar charm. Gregory's simplicity, naturalness, and artless candor easily fascinate every reader and cause him to forget for the moment the weak and defective elements of the work. The proper value of this inestimable work arises from its peculiarly important subject-matter and is enhanced by the utter inadequateness of all other historical authorities regarding the period and peoples that it treats of. Von Giesebrecht says of the Historia Francorum that «it holds a distinguished place among the most important works of historical literature».

2. LITERATURE ON GREGORY. — Until lately the best edition of the works of Gregory was that of *Th. Ruinart,* Paris, 1699: *Migne,* PL., lxxi. It is now surpassed by the edition of *W. Arndt* and *Br. Krusch,* Gregorii Turonensis opera (Monum. Germ. hist. Script. rer. Meroving. i), Hannover, 1884—1885, part I, 1—450: Historia Francorum, ed. *W Arndt;* part II (451—881): Miracula et opera minora, ed. *Br. Krusch;* among the latter opuscula (821—846): Gregorii episc. Turon. liber de miraculis b. Andreae apostoli, ed. *M. Bonnett* (also in a separate reprint). In this edition of Gregory there are owing to the special industry of *Krusch* an Index (884 to 911), Orthographica (912—928), Lexica et grammatica (929—963). We are indebted to these editors for the first successful attempt to reconstruct the original diction of Gregory. Earlier editions, based on more modern manuscripts, exhibited a text corrected to resemble in some sense the carefully polished Latin of the Carlovingian epoch; *Arndt* and *Krusch* went back to the earliest manuscripts, and, though all of this series are incomplete and abound in gaps and breaks, they reach back as far as the seventh century, and are almost contemporaneous with Gregory himself; in them appears in all its original crudeness the linguistic barbarism of Merovingian society. For the manuscript tradition of the separate works of Gregory cf. *Krusch* and *Bonnet,* in Neues Archiv für ältere deutsche

Geschichtskunde (1886), xi. 629; (1887), xii. 303—308 309—314; (1894), xix. 25—45. *H. Omont,* Grégoire de Tours, Histoire des Francs, livres i—vi. Texte du ms. de Corbie, Bibl. nat. ms. lat. 17655, avec un fac-similé, Paris, 1887. *G. Collon,* Grégoire de Tours, Histoire des Francs, livres vii—x. Texte du ms. de Bruxelles, Paris, 1893. The Liber de miraculis b. Thomae apostoli, lacking in the edition of Arndt and Krusch, was edited by *M. Bonnet,* in Acta Thomae (Suppl. cod. apocr. i), Leipzig, 1883, pp. 96—132 (cf. Praef., pp. xiii ff.). *Krusch* also re-edited the Passio ss. martyrum septem dormientium (in the edition of *Arndt* and *Krusch,* pp. 847—853), in Analecta Bollandiana (1893), xii. 371—387. Cf. *G. Osterhage,* Bemerkungen zu Gregor von Tours' kleineren Schriften (Progr.), Berlin, 1895. An excellent German version of the «ten books of Frankish history» was made by *W. v. Giesebrecht,* Berlin, 1851, 2 vols.; 2. ed., Leipzig, 1878 (Die Geschichtsschreiber der deutschen Vorzeit in deutscher Bearbeitung, 6. century, iv—v). — For the life and times of Gregory cf. *J. W. Loebell,* Gregor von Tours und seine Zeit, Leipzig, 1839; 2. ed., enlarged, with preface by *H. v. Sybel,* 1869. *W. Wattenbach,* Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen im Mittelalter, 6. ed., i. 93—103. *L. v. Ranke,* Weltgeschichte (1.—3. ed.), iv 2, 328—368. *M. Bonnet,* Le Latin de Grégoire de Tours, Paris, 1890. For other works on Gregory of Tours cf. *A. Potthast,* Bibl. hist. med. aevi, 2. ed., i. 542—545. A work of special utility for the Historia Francorum is that of *J. Woisin,* Studien zur Geschichte des 4. u. 5. Jahrhunderts, Meldorf, 1901. *K. Weimann,* Die sittlichen Begriffe in Gregors von Tours Historia Francorum (Dissert. inaug.), Duisburg, 1900.

3. VENANTIUS FORTUNATUS. — Venantius Honorius Clementianus Fortunatus was born about 530 in North-Eastern Italy, near Treviso. He was educated at Ravenna, where his early tastes inclined him to the study of grammar, rhetoric, and jurisprudence; philosophy and theology had little or no attraction for him. Poetry, however, was a beloved occupation of Venantius, even while still a student at Ravenna. A disease of the eye, contracted there, was cured by rubbing the ailing part with oil from a lamp kept burning before the image of St. Martin in one of the city churches. In gratitude for this intercession of the Saint, Fortunatus undertook to visit his tomb at Tours (565). This journey, however, was really more like the free wanderings of a poet than the pilgrimage of a pious penitent. His travels led him from Germany to Austrasia, in which land he found king Sigibert occupied with the preparations for his marriage to Brunhilde. Fortunatus won the king's favor, and acquired moreover the reputation of a distinguished poet by the Epithalamium which he wrote for the wedding of the royal pair. After a two years sojourn at the court of Sigibert, he continued his journey, but in no great haste. As he went along, he sought from all persons of standing, ecclesiastics or laymen, a hospitality that his polished and agreeable demeanor at once assured him; he repaid his hosts with flattering panegyrics in verse. He arrived finally at Tours, where he received a friendly welcome from Euphronius, the bishop of that city. But neither Euphronius nor St. Martin's tomb were able to retain him long at Tours; he soon took up his staff and troubadour-like

travelled afoot from house to house, through all Southern Gaul. A visit to Poitiers brought his travels to an end. There dwelt in this city, in the monastery of the Holy Cross, two Thuringian princesses, Radegunde widow of the Frankish king Chlotar I. († 561), and her adopted daughter Agnes. The ideal personalities of these two holy women wrought so powerfully on the sensitive poet that he abandoned his travels, renounced his intention of returning to Italy, and took up his permanent residence at Poitiers. In his friendly, and even intimate, relations, with Radegunde and Agnes he found a new country. In deference to their urgent desire he was ordained a priest by the bishop of Poitiers and took on himself the spiritual service of the little community of Holy Cross nuns. But even here he was moved to vary his sojourn by occasional journeys. His relations with nearly all the prominent personages of Gaul were very intimate, particularly with Gregory of Tours. Towards the end of the sixth century, he was chosen bishop of Poitiers. He does not seem to have long survived this elevation, his death occurred early in the seventh century. Venantius is no grave historian like his friend Gregory; he is a poet with all the vivacity and cheerfulness of his kind. He is also possessed of eminent ability in his art; no poet of this decadent period can approach the easy skill with which he describes in fluent verse the things and events of daily life. On the other hand, he, too, pays tribute to the degenerate taste of his contemporaries. In general his diction is over-wrought and affected. His numerous panegyrical poems exhibit great lack of dignity, and a morbid delight in exaggeration. Most of his minor poems have reached us in a collection made up of eleven books, entitled: Carmina or Miscellanea. In its original shape this collection was undoubtedly his own work. All extant manuscripts, with one exception, are reproductions of an imperfect copy of these collected poems. That exception is an eighth- or ninth-century Paris codex which contains selections from the complete collection and thirty-one other poems that were lacking in the incomplete copy just mentioned. Most of the poetical effusions of Venantius come under the head of occasional verses. The places visited by him, the people who entertained him, the banquets prepared for him, in a word personal matters of any kind, furnished him with more or less successful themes for the exercise of his poetic skill. Naturally these little carmina are a very accurate mirror of the author and his times. The collection contains three ecclesiastical hymns, two of which, the: Pange lingua gloriosi (ii. 2), and the: Vexilla regis prodeunt (ii. 6), are distinguished not only for the splendor of their new and beautiful imagery, but also for the depth and intensity of emotion that they manifest. Several other hymns attributed to Fortunatus, though of doubtful authenticity, have reached us, but not in the afore-mentioned way. Apart from the

Passion-hymns, three elegies of Venantius composed at the suggestion, or to speak more particularly in the name, of Radegunde, are highly praised as the gems of his collection. Among them is the touching lamentation for the fall of the royal house of Thuringia: De excidio Thoringiae. Some prose-compositions were also included in the original collection of the writings of Venantius, besides letters e. g. a diffuse exposition of the Pater Noster (x. 1) and an exposition of the Apostles' Creed (xi. 1), the latter a neatly-executed abbreviation of the well-known work of Rufinus (§ 92, 3). Independently of the collected writings of our poet, a long epic poem: De vita S. Martini, has come down, in four books (two thousand two hundred and forty-three hexameters). A prefatory letter, addressed to Gregory of Tours, says that it was finished within two months: inter bimestre spatium. In reality it is only a metrical abbreviation of the writings of Sulpicius Severus on St. Martin (Vita S. Martini and Dialogues, § 92, 1). The corresponding work of Paulinus of Petricordia (§ 112, 3) was also put to good use by Venantius. In this work Germanus, bishop of Paris († May 8., 576), is mentioned as still alive (iv. 636); Venantius must, therefore, have composed his epic before that date. He wrote also some lives of the Saints in prose, for popular edification and in comparatively simple style. Other such biographies are erroneously attributed to him. The following are considered genuine: a life of St. Hilary of Poitiers with the: Liber de virtutibus (i. e. miraculis) S. Hilarii, lives of St. Marcellus, bishop of Paris († 436), of St. Albinus, bishop of Angers († 560), of St. Paternus, bishop of Avranches († 563), of the afore-mentioned St. Germanus of Paris, and a life of St. Radegunde († 587).

4. LITERATURE ON FORTUNATUS. — The best of the earlier editions of Fortunatus is admittedly that of the Benedictine *M. A. Luchi*, Rome, 1786 to 1787, 2 vols. (*Migne*, PL., lxxxviii, inclusive of the carmina since discovered). The latest and best edition is that of *Leo* and *Krusch*: V H. Cl. Fortunati opera poetica, rec. et emend. *F. Leo;* opera pedestria, rec. et emend. *Br. Krusch*, Berlin, 1881—1885 (Monum. Germ. hist. Auct. antiquiss. iv). *Leo* was the first to establish a reliable text of the carmina, based on many manuscripts; in his edition the diction and metre of Fortunatus are learnedly discussed. *Ch. Nisard* maintains, in Revue historique (1888), xxxvii. 49—57, (1889), xli. 241—252, that the two elegies: De excidio Thoringiae and Ad Artachin, were written by Radegunde herself; cf. *W Lippert*, in Zeitschrift des Vereins für thüringische Geschichte und Altertumskunde (1890), new series, vii. 16—38 (against Nisard). On the hymns of Fortunatus see *J. Kaiser*, Beiträge zur Gesch. und Erklärung der Kirchenhymnen, 2. ed., Paderborn, 1881, pp. 386—434 and 477. On the Vita S. Hilarii and Liber de virtutibus S. Hilarii see *J. H. Reinkens*, Hilarius von Poitiers, Schaffhausen, 1864, pp. xvi—xxii. — The life and writings of Fortunatus are treated of at length by *F. Hamelin*, De vita et operibus V H. Cl. Fortunati, Pictaviensis episcopi, Rennes, 1873. *A. Schneider*, Lesefrüchte aus Venantius Fortunatus, Innsbruck, 1882. *Fr. Leo*, Venantius Fortunatus, in Deutsche Rundschau (1882), xxxii. 414—426.

*Ch. Nisard,* Le poète Fortunat, Paris, 1890. *W Meyer,* Der Gelegenheitsdichter Venantius Fortunatus, Berlin, 1901, in Abhandlungen der kgl. Gesellsch. der Wissensch. zu Göttingen. This dissertation contains important considerations concerning the dates, nature and occasions of the Carmina. *J Dostal,* Über Identität und Zeit von Personen bei Venantius Fortunatus (Progr.), Vienna, 1901. *G. Semeria,* Gli inni della Chiesa; viii: l'inno della Croce, Milan, 1903. — St. Germanus of Paris, whose life was written by Fortunatus, is said to be the author of an Epistola ad Brunichildem reginam, a Privilegium monasterii S. Germani, and an Expositio brevis antiquae liturgiae gallicanae (*Migne,* PL., lxxii. 77—98). The Epistola is certainly genuine; cf. *W Gundlach,* in Monum. Germ. hist. Epistolae (1892), iii. 122—124. For the spurious Expositio liturgiae see *H. Koch,* in Theol. Quartalschr. (1900), lxxxii. 525 ff. — Nicetius, bishop of Trier († ca. 566) and friend of Fortunatus, left two epistolae: Ad Chlodosvindam reginam Longobardorum, and Ad Justinianum imper. (*Migne,* PL., lxviii. 375—380, also in *Gundlach,* l. c., pp. 118—122). For the treatises De vigiliis servorum Dei and De psalmodiae bono (*Migne,* l. c., 356—376) see § 90, 12. — Of Ferreolus, bishop of Uzès (Depart. Gard), who died in 581, Gregory of Tours writes (Hist. Franc., vi. 7) Libros aliquot epistolarum quasi Sidonium (§ 112, 2) secutus composuit. He wrote also a Regula ad monachos (*Migne,* PL., lxvi. 959—976). — Some homilies are current (Ib., lxxii. 771—774) under the name of Sedatus, bishop of Biterrae (Béziers). He died about 589.

### § 118. Pope St. Gregory the Great.

1. HIS LIFE. — Gregory I., one of the greatest successors of St. Peter, meets us at the end of the ancient life and order, or rather, on the threshold of the Middle Ages. With the exception of Leo I. none of the ancient popes affected so profoundly and in so many new ways the ecclesiastical and civil conditions of his time. Gregory was born at Rome, probably in 540, and descended from a family at once noble and rich. As son of a patrician house he adopted a public career and became pretor at an early age, certainly before 571. The glory of life and worldly grandeur seem to have fascinated him for a while. From his youth, however, he had cherished the idea of devoting himself entirely and solely to the service of God. After much hesitation he followed this impulse of divine grace, abandoned his earthly pursuits, and sold his inheritance, gave to the poor a portion of the money, and with the rest built seven monasteries, six in Sicily and one at Rome in his own palace on the Hill of Scaurus (Monte Celio). He became a monk in the latter monastery, and observed the rule of St. Benedict with so much exactness that he ruined his health, never very robust, and was near dying. At the end of his life he still recalled with regret these golden days of monastic peace. Pope Benedict I. drew him from this quiet haven and made him a cardinal-deacon or regionarius, and Pelagius II., his successor, sent him as apocrisiarius or nuncio to the emperor Tiberius at Constantinople. In 584 or 585 he re-entered his monastery, and was soon chosen to be its abbot. The

sight of some Anglo-Saxon youths in the slave market of Rome awoke in Gregory the desire to go to England and become the missionary of Christianity and civilization to that people. With the good will of Pope Pelagius he left the city secretly, and began his journey, but the Roman people compelled the pope to recall their benefactor and their idol. Pelagius died Feb. 7., 590, and Gregory was at once elected to succeed him, by the unanimous vote of senate, clergy, and people. He made every effort to escape the burden of the papacy, but in vain. On the receipt from Constantinople of his confirmation by the emperor Maurice, he was accompanied to St. Peter's as in a triumphant procession by all the people of Rome, and consecrated Sept. 3., 590. He tells us himself[1] that he assumed the direction of the Church, when it resembled an old ship, flooded on all sides by the waves, and the timbers of which, battered by unceasing storms, proclaimed only too loudly that the vessel was on the verge of shipwreck. Italy was visited by inundations, pestilence and famine; the Lombards were everywhere burning and slaughtering; the ecclesiastical province of Milan was still in a state of schism because of the condemnation of the Three Chapters; the Greek schism, reserved for later days, was already casting a menacing shadow; civil order seemed everywhere shaken to its foundations. By a union of gentleness and resolution Gregory succeeded in quieting somewhat this universal disorder. Few great men in Church or State ever combined in so high a degree as Gregory an affectionate and pleasing deference, towards the civil authority, with firmness of purpose and energy of execution; perhaps no pope ever conceived so adequate an idea of his high office or realized it with such breadth and fulness. When the patriarch of Constantinople proudly assumes the title of ecumenical bishop (§ 106, 2), Gregory takes that of *servus servorum Dei*. His own interests do not concern him, and consequently he won all men over to the interests of God. In the twelve years of his pontificate he succeeded in uplifting the fallen ecclesiastical state, in relieving much social suffering, and in bettering the conditions of a great part of mankind. He laid the foundations of the mediæval Church and of the political power of the papacy Gregory believed, in as far as such belief was compatible with his persuasion of the near end of the world, that the future belonged to the Teutonic peoples. He aided them to establish a new political order amid the surrounding chaos. Clausier says rightly that Gregory and the Middle Ages were born on the same day. The holy pontiff, it seems, prized above all other triumphs the success of Augustine and his companions, whose mission to England he had conceived and organized. In the last years of his life he was sorely afflicted by

[1] Registrum ep., i. 4.

sickness, and could rise from his bed only to assist at the more solemn ecclesiastical festivals. He died early in March, 604.

2. WRITINGS OF GREGORY. — The *Registrum epistolarum*, or collection of his official letters, is at once an eloquent monument of his spirit and a reliable mirror of his pontifical zeal and energy. This important work, according to the researches of Ewald, has reached us only in fragments. The original Letter-Book of Gregory is lost, and is now known to us only in three ancient compendia, each of which however arose independently of the others. The longest of these compendia, which alone merits the name of Registrum, was compiled under Hadrian I. (772—795) for Charlemagne. It contains six hundred and eighty-six or (three letters being repeated) six hundred and eighty-three letters. It is arranged chronologically according to the indictions, and includes the entire pontificate of Gregory. The second collection includes two hundred letters, all of them probably dating from the second indiction (598—599). The third collection varies in extent: it includes, as a rule, fifty-one letters; in some manuscripts more are given, they are all taken from three non-consecutive indictions (xiii iv x). The latter two collections are probably older than the first. As they contain one hundred and sixty-five letters that are lacking in the first, the total number of Gregory's letters is eight hundred and forty-eight. Some other letters have reached us, by different channels, but their authenticity is doubtful. The famous and much-controverted Answer of Gregory to certain questions of Augustine, bishop of Canterbury[1], known only through Beda's reference to it[2], is now generally considered spurious. While the Letter-Book of Gregory throws a strong light upon his tireless pastoral zeal, it also reveals in him the great qualities of a statesman and an administrator. The most minute details engage his attention; his vigilant eye rests with earnest affection on the remotest corners of the known world. The model of a perfect shepherd of souls that these letters exhibit in practical life, is put before us from a theoretical standpoint in Gregory's famous *Liber regulae pastoralis*, written about 591 and dedicated to John, archbishop of Ravenna. The latter had reproached Gregory with his attempted flight on the eve of his election to the papacy, an act that Gregory undertakes to justify, after the manner of Gregory of Nazianzus (§ 68, 4) and Chrysostom (§ 74, 8), by explaining the sublimity and difficulty of the ecclesiastical office. In the preface to the first section of this book he describes the requisites for the pastoral office (ad culmen quisque regiminis qualiter veniat); in the second section the manner of life incumbent on the shepherd of souls (ad hoc rite perveniens qualiter vivat); in the third section, at once longer and more important than the others, the character and manner of pastoral teaching

[1] Registrum ep., xi. 4. [2] Hist. eccl. gent. Angl., i. 27.

(bene vivens qualiter doceat); the fourth and last section, consisting of only one chapter, reminds the ecclesiastical shepherd that he should practise daily the habit of self-recollection (recte docens infirmitatem suam quotidie quanta consideratione cognoscat). This work of Gregory met with universal approval; it was translated into Greek by Anastasius II., patriarch of Antioch (§ 107, 1), and into Anglo-Saxon by king Alfred of England († 901). Gregory also wrote (593) in four books a work entitled *Dialogi* with the sub-title (in many manuscripts): de vita et miraculis patrum Italicorum et de aeternitate animarum. Worn out with worldly cares, the pope had withdrawn to a lonely place where he gave vent to the unhappiness he felt at not being able to devote himself to the salvation of his soul in monastic peace and retirement. In his solitude he is visited by the deacon Peter, a friend of his youth, to whom he makes known the secret cause of his melancholy, by recalling the example of many holy men in former times who had abandoned all earthly concerns and sought thenceforth only the perfection of their spiritual life. Peter professes ignorance of the fact that there had lived in Italy so many holy men through whom God had performed miracles; at his request Gregory undertakes to relate something of their lives and miraculous deeds, partly from his personal recollections, partly from the evidence of trustworthy witnesses. The first and third book introduce to us a number of saintly Italians endowed with miraculous powers, all of them otherwise unknown to us, apart from a few distinguished persons like Paulinus of Nola (iii. 1). The whole of the second book is devoted to the miracles of St. Benedict of Nursia. In the fourth book, Gregory dwells with pleasure on those miracles that prove the survival of the soul after death. This work, so thoroughly characterized by the contemporary faith in the miraculous, was transcribed and translated with such rapidity that it was soon a household book in all parts of the Christian world. A work of far greater importance is his voluminous: Expositio in librum Job sive Moralium libri xxxv, begun by Gregory while he was legate at Constantinople, but not finished until after his election to the papacy In the dedicatory epistle to Leander, archbishop of Seville, the author says that he will expound the Book of Job in a triple sense: the historical, allegorical, and moral. He is all too brief and sparing in the historical elucidation of the text, though the deeper speculative or contemplative sense is treated with some fulness. On the other hand, the practical application of the text of Job is carried out so exhaustively that this work was recognized at once as a thesaurus of moral theology. Several other exegetical works attributed to Gregory are either of dubious provenance or are certainly spurious: Commentarii in librum I Regum, Expositio super Cantica canticorum, Expositio in septem Psalmos poenitentiales, Concordia quorumdam testimonio-

rum S. Scripturae. The: Homiliae xl in Evangelia are probably his sermons on the Gospels for the Sundays and holidays during 590—591; twenty of them were dictated by Gregory to a notary and read by the latter to the assembled people. The other twenty were delivered by him in the churches of Rome and taken down by tachygraphers. They were soon published against his will by admirers of Gregory, whereupon the pope made a new collection of these homilies (592 or 593) in two books. To this edition of the 40 homilies is usually added a powerful penitential discourse of Gregory delivered during the pestilence of 590. The: Homiliae xxii in Ezechielem, preached in the autumn of 593, are also divided into two books, the first of which (Hom. i—xii) deals with Ezechiel i—iv, and the second (xiii—xxii) with Ezechiel xl. There breathes in all these homilies an affectionate and fatherly spirit; the diction is at once simple and vigorous. Biblical texts are interpreted in an allegorical sense. His homilies on the Gospels furnished favorite reading matter for the liturgy, as well for the mediæval monks both in chapter and in refectory. The so-called *Sacramentarium Gregorianum* is attributed by Duchesne (1889) to Hadrian I., and renamed: Sacramentarium Hadriani. Probst contends (1892) that it rightly bears the name of Gregory, having been re-arranged and completed by him. It is certain that the Sacramentarium of the Roman Church underwent a thorough reform at the hands of Gregory. If now we admit that the Sacramentarium Gelasianum belongs to an earlier period (§ 114, 1), and is in no sense a Gregorian compilation, it follows that we must recognize in the Sacramentarium Gregorianum the outcome of Gregory's liturgical reforms. There is also no reason for abandoning the venerable traditions that assign to Gregory the permanent laws and arrangement of the liturgical melodies as sung in the public or choral service (Cantus Gregorianus) of the Church. Quite recently Gevaert and others have questioned the accuracy of these traditions which have been defended by Dom Morin and others. The eight hymns attributed to Gregory are certainly spurious.

3. CHARACTERISTICS OF GREGORY'S WRITINGS. — Gregory is particularly great and deserving of all praise in the province of practical ecclesiastical life and administration. His writings are throughout eminently practical, and make no pretence to artistic disposition of material, or elegance of expression. The age of Gregory was marked by a profound intellectual decadence and collapse. The large and free play of mind, the vigorous creative power of a former age are henceforth no more than memories; it is enough if men can rescue from encroaching barbarism the intellectual treasures of a bygone period. Gregory is not called on to discover and refute new subtleties of heresy; his duty is to revive the sinking courage of humanity, to withstand the pressure of despair upon the hearts of

the conquered Romans and to temper the ignorant arrogance of the conquerors. It is no longer the teaching office, but the healing, helping and saving ministry of the Christian shepherd that is in demand. There was scarcely any one who could better understand the wounded hearts of men, who could explain more exactly their infirmities and wants, who could point out more clearly and more fervently the right remedies, than Gregory The writings of Gregory contain little or nothing that is characteristic in the province of Christian doctrine, his intimate conviction of the imminent end of the world was shared by many Christians of his time. The new and strange disorders of nature and the continuous horrors of the wars of the sixth century seemed like so many heralds of the last judgment. Gregory writes: Depopulatae urbes, eversa castra, concrematae ecclesiae, destructa sunt monasteria virorum ac feminarum, desolata ab hominibus praedia atque ab omni cultore destituta, in solitudine vacat terra, nullus hanc possessor inhabitat, occupaverunt bestiae loca quae prius multitudo hominum tenebat. Et quid in aliis mundi partibus agatur ignoro. Nam in hac terra in qua nos vivimus finem suum mundus iam non nuntiat, sed ostendit[1] Ecce iam mundus in se ipso aruit ubique mors, ubique luctus, ubique desolatio finis temporalium ostendit quam nihil sit quod transire potuit, casus rerum indicat quia res transiens et tunc prope nihil fuit cum stare videretur[2].

4. COMPLETE AND PARTIAL EDITIONS. TRANSLATIONS. RECENSIONS. — Complete editions of the works of Gregory were published by bishop Petrus Tossianensis of Venusi (Venosa), Rome, 1588—1593, 6 vols.; by P. Goussainville (Gussanvillaeus), Paris, 1675, 3 vols., and by the Maurists, Paris, 1705, 4 vols.; the last edition was reprinted at Venice, 1744. Another edition appeared at Venice, 1768—1776, in 17 vols., with some improvements and additions, by J. B. Gallicioli (*Migne,* PL., lxxv—lxxix). The Maurist edition of St. Gregory does not rank among the best labors of the Benedictines; Sainte Marthe (Sammarthanus) to whom we owe this edition, was no Mabillon. — *P. Ewald* began, and after his death *L. M. Hartmann* completed, a new edition of the Registrum Epistolarum that will long remain the authoritative text: Gregorii I. Papae Registrum epistolarum, i—ii, Berlin, 1891—1899 (Monum. Germ. hist. Epist. i—ii). We owe to Ewald also the letters of Gregory as arranged in *Jaffé,* Regesta Pontif. Rom. (1885), 2. ed., i. 143—219. *N. Turchi* edited: Sancti Gregorii Magni Epistolae Selectae, Rome, 1907, vol. i, pars I, Series vii, of the Bibliotheca Sanctorum Patrum. For other works concerning the correspondence of Gregory I. see *A. Potthast,* Bibl. Hist. med. aevi, 2. ed., i. 539 f. For the Responsa of Gregory to the questions of the bishop Augustine of Canterbury (Registr. xi. 64) cf. *L. Duchesne,* Origines du culte chrétien, Paris, 1889, pp. 93—94, also the English translation, London, 1904; *Sägmüller,* in Theol. Quartalschr (1899), lxxxi. 160. *Th. Kranzfelder* translated into German select letters of Gregory, Kempten, 1874 (Bibliothek der Kirchenväter). The Regula pastoralis has often been re-edited and reprinted, e. g. by *E. W. Westhoff,* Münster, 1860; *H. Hurter,* SS. Patr. opusc. sel., xx. Recent German versions are owing to *C. Haas,* Die

[1] Dial., iii. 38. [2] Hom. in Evang., ii. 28.

Pastoralschriften des hl. Gregor d. Gr. und des hl. Ambrosius von Mailand übersetzt, Tübingen, 1862, pp. 1—235, and *Th. Kranzfelder,* Kempten, 1873 (Bibl. der Kirchenväter). *A. M. Micheletti,* S. Gregorii papae cognomento Magni «Regula pastoralis», Tournai, 1904. *B. Sauter,* Des heiligen Papstes Gregorius d. Gr. Pastoralregel, Freiburg, 1904. For a new text-recension of some extracts ex Gregorii Magni dialogorum libris see *G. Waitz,* in Mon. Germ. hist. script. rer. Langob. et Italic. saec. vi—ix, Hannover, 1878; in German by *Th. Kranzfelder,* Kempten, 1873. *L. Wiese,* Die Sprache der Dialoge, Halle, 1900 (with an appendix: Sermo de sapientia and moralium in Job fragmenta). *H. Zwirmann,* Das Verhältnis der altlothringischen Übersetzung der Homilien Gregors über Ezechiel zum Original und zu der Übersetzung der Predigten Bernhards, Halle, 1904. The Greek version that accompanies the Latin text of the Dialogues (*Migne,* PL., lxxvii. 149—430) was made by Pope Zachary (741—752); cf. *H. Delehaye,* St. Grégoire le Grand dans l'hagiographie grecque, in Analecta Bollandiana (1904), pp. 449—454. A new edition of the life of St. Benedict, in the second book of the Dialogues (*Migne,* PL., lvi. 125—204), is owing to *P. Cozza-Luzzi,* Rome, 1880. San Gregorio Magno ed i monasteri sublacensi. Contributio dei monaci sublacensi al congresso storico-liturgico (nel xiii centenario), Rome, 1904. *B. Sauter,* O. S. B., Der heilige Vater Benediktus nach St. Gregor dem Großen. Zum 13. Zentenarium des hl. Gregor herausgegeben von seinen Mönchen, Freiburg, 1904. The Homiliae xl in evangelia are also found in *Hurter,* SS. Patr. opusc. sel., series ii, t. vi, Innsbruck, 1892; cf. *G. Pfeilschifter,* Die authentische Ausgabe der Evangelienhomilien Gregors d. Gr., Munich, 1900 (Veröffentlichungen aus dem kirchenhistor. Seminar München, no. 4). For the Sacramentarium Gregorianum see the works of *Duchesne* and *Probst* (§ 97, 3), also *Probst,* Die abendländische Messe vom 5. bis zum 8. Jahrhundert, Münster, 1896. *E. Bishop,* On some early manuscripts of the Gregorianum, in Journal of Theological Studies (1902—1903), iv. 411—426 (the genuine text of the Registrum sent by Hadrian I. to Charlemagne is represented by one series of manuscripts based on Cod. Vat. Reg. 327). The relations of Gregory to plain-chant are discussed by *F. A. Gevaert,* Les origines du chant liturgique de l'église latine, Ghent, 1890. *Id.,* La mélopée antique dans le chant de l'église latine, Ghent, 1895. *G. Morin,* Der Ursprung des Gregorianischen Gesanges (from the French, 1890), by *Th. Elsässer,* Paderborn, 1892. The origin of the hymns attributed to Gregory is treated by *Manitius,* Gesch. der christl.-latein. Poesie, Stuttgart, 1891, pp. 384—388.

5. WORKS ON GREGORY. — A hitherto unedited Vita S. Gregorii, written in England early in the eighth century, is described by *F Ewald,* Die älteste Biographie Gregors I., in Historische Aufsätze dem Andenken an G. Waitz gewidmet, Hannover, 1886, pp. 17—54; *F. A. Gasquet,* A Life of Pope Gregory the Great, written by a monk of Whitby (probably about 713), London, 1904. The Vita S. Gregorii of Paulus Diaconus (Paul Warnefried), written in the second half of the eighth century (*Migne,* PL., lxxv 41—59), was edited, in its original form, from Italian manuscripts by *H. Grisar,* in Zeitschrift für kath. Theol. (1887), xi. 158 to 173. Johannes Diaconus wrote a third Vita S. Gregorii at Rome in 872 or 873 (*Migne,* PL., lxxv. 59—242). Among the modern lives of Gregory we may mention. *Fr.* and *P. Böhringer,* Die Väter des Papsttums: Leo I. und Gregor I., Stuttgart, 1879 (Die Kirche Christi und ihre Zeugen, new edition). *W Wisbaum,* Die wichtigsten Richtungen und Ziele der Tätigkeit des Papstes Gregor d. Gr. (Inaug.-Diss.), Leipzig, 1885. *Ed. Clausier,* St. Grégoire le Grand, pape et docteur de l'église, Paris, 1886 1891. *C. Wolfsgruber,* Gregor d. Gr., Saulgau, 1890. The Civiltà

Cattolica, series 14, vol. v—ix (1890—1891), and series 15, vol. i—v (1892 to 1893) contains a number of articles entitled: Il pontificato di S. Gregorio Magno nella storia della civiltà cristiana, reprinted in *H. Grisar,* Roma alla fine del mondo antico, part III, Rome, 1899. *Fr. Görres,* Papst Gregor der Große und Kaiser Phocas, in Zeitschr. für wissenschaftliche Theol. (1901), xliv. 592—602. *T. Bonsmann,* Gregor I. der Große, ein Lebensbild (1890). *R. Sabbadini,* Gregorio Magno e la grammatica, in Bolletino di filologia classica (1902), viii. 204—206 259. *T. Hodgkin,* Italy and her invaders, London, 1895, vol. v, cc. 7—10. *B. Gatta,* Un parallelo storico (Marco Aurelio, Gregorio Magno), Milano, R. Instituto lombardo, 1901. *K. Mann,* The Lives of the Popes in the early Middle Ages, London, 1902, i. 1—250. *F. Homes Dudden,* Gregory the Great, his Place in History and Thought, London, 1905. *H. Grisar,* San Gregorio Magno (590—604), Rome, 1904. *J. Doize,* Deux études sur l'administration temporelle du pape Grégoire le Grand, Paris, 1904. *D. E. Benedetti,* S. Gregorio Magno e la schiavitù, Rome, 1904. *G. Cappello,* Gregorio I. e il suo pontificato (540—604), Saluzzo, 1904.

6. IMMEDIATE PREDECESSORS OF GREGORY I. — The Epistolae Ioannis P. III. (560—573 *Migne,* PL., lxxii. 13—18), also the Epistolae Benedicti P. I. (574—578. Ib., lxxii. 683—686), are spurious. On the Epistolae et decreta Pelagii P. II. (578—590: Ib., lxxii. 703—760) cf. *F. Kaltenbrunner,* in *Jaffé,* Reg. Pontif. Rom., 2. ed. (1885), i. 137—140.

7. THE LIBER PONTIFICALIS. — This is the name usually given to a series of biographical sketches of the popes beginning with St. Peter and reaching far into the mediæval period. The lives are arranged in the order of the papal succession. Under the name of each pope are given brief indications of his family, the length of his reign, the disciplinary decrees issued by him, the ecclesiastical edifices he built, and occasionally accounts of historico-political events are added. At the end of each vita are always found some statements concerning the number of ordinations performed by the pope, the date and place of his burial and the period during which the see was vacant. The earliest of these papal notitiae are extremely brief, laconic, and composed in almost lapidary style. After the fourth century they grow longer. In the eighth and ninth centuries some of these lives become formal histories of the popes. Since the sixteenth century it had been customary to ascribe the authorship of this work to Anastasius Bibliothecarius, a Roman writer who lived in the latter part of the ninth century. It is now well-known that the work is of much earlier origin, and that Anastasius had nothing to do with its composition. The book has grown gradually. The oldest part of it, from St. Peter to Felix IV (530), was compiled in the reign of Pope Boniface II. (530—532) by a Roman ecclesiastic. His principal historical authority for the earliest times was the Catalogus Liberianus (§ 88, 8). The so-called Catalogus Felicianus, however, a short history of the popes to Felix IV (530), is not, as some have maintained, a source or the oldest redaction of this first part of the Liber Pontificalis, but rather a later compendium of the same; it is the work of unknown but generally contemporary writers, and was afterwards completed and extended to Hadrian II. († 872) or Stephen V. († 891), though some manuscripts still give a fragment of the latter pope's life and omit the popes between Hadrian II. and Stephen. This second and later part of the book covers the period between the sixth and the ninth centuries, and is in general an historical authority of the highest rank, while the first and older part of the work, apart from its later lives, is both untrustworthy and defective in historical contents. Until lately the best edition

of the Liber Pontificalis was that of *Fr. Bianchini,* Rome, 1718 ff., 4 vols., (*Migne,* PL., cxxvii—cxxix). A new edition of this work universally recognized as monumental, is owing to *L. Duchesne:* Le Liber pontificalis. Texte, introduction et commentaire, Paris, 1886—1892, 2 vols. (Bibliothèque des Ecoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome, 2. series, iii). The first volume of this edition goes as far as 795, the second does not stop at the end of the ninth century, but exhibits later continuations as far as 1431. Another new edition was begun by *Th. Mommsen,* in Monum. Germ. hist. Gesta pontif. Rom., Berlin, 1898, i. Cf. *Duchesne,* in Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire (1898), xviii. 381—417, and *H. Grisar,* Il Liber Pontificalis fino al secolo ix, in Analecta Romana, Rome, 1899, i. 1—25.

### § 119. St. Martin of Bracara and St. Isidore of Seville.

1. MARTIN OF BRACARA. — Martin of Bracara (Braga) was born in Pannonia and became a monk in Palestine, but spent the greater part of his life in Gallecia or Northwestern Spain. He was for a time abbot of Dumio, a monastery near Braga, the residence of the Suevic kings. At the first synod of Bracara (561), he signs as bishop of Dumio, hence the appellation *Martinus Dumiensis.* In 572, at the second synod of Bracara, we meet him as metropolitan of Bracara (Martinus Bracarensis). His mission was the conversion of the Suevic tribes in Spain from Arianism to Catholicism. He died in 580 and is honored as a Saint. Gregory of Tours is witness[1] that Martin was second to none of his contemporaries in virtue and learning. Most of his writings are moral or ascetical in contents. The best known is his: Formula vitae honestae, as he entitles it himself, or: De differentiis quattuor virtutum, as Isidore of Seville[2] calls it. This work is preceded by a dedicatory epistle addressed to the Suevic king, Miro (570—583), who had frequently besought Martin to address him occasionally a word of consolation or instruction. The writer then proceeds to develop the moral precepts of the natural law from the stand-point of the four platonic cardinal virtues: prudentia, magnanimitas s. fortitudo, continentia s. temperantia, iustitia. This exposition of the natural law was probably borrowed from some lost work of Seneca. Another little work of Martin is entitled: De ira, and is now known to be a compendium of the three books of Seneca: De ira. On the other hand, it is Christian morality that is developed in the treatises: Pro repellenda iactantia, De superbia, Exhortatio humilitatis, that form a single group, and were all addressed to Miro. The sermon: De correctione rusticorum aims at extirpating the pagan ideas and superstitious customs current among the peasantry of his diocese, and offers many interesting details of importance for the history of European culture and Christian preaching: it was decided by the second council of Bracara that in their pastoral visitations the bishops should make every effort to extirpate from Suevic

[1] Hist. Franc., v. 37. [2] De viris ill., c. 35.

society the *errores idolorum;* for his better instruction Polemius, bishop of Asturica (Astorga), asked Martin to send him a short instruction de origine idolorum et sceleribus ipsorum. Martin's reply was this work; he tells Polemius that it was a sermon, and that he might make good use of it in the visitation of his diocese. The two collections: Aegyptiorum patrum sententiae, and: Verba seniorum, are versions from the Greek; the first was made by Martin while still abbot of Dumio, the second, at Dumio also, by the monk Paschasius, at the request and with the aid of Martin. A collection of pious sayings: Libellus de moribus, and a treatise: De paupertate, containing many quotations from the letters of Seneca, are considered spurious. In the history of the sources and literature of mediæval canon law Martin merits a place by reason of the so-called: Capitula Martini, a collection of canons, mostly of Oriental but containing some Western canons (Spanish and African), and compiled after 561. The first part of this collection treats of the clergy and contains sixty-eight canons; the second treats chiefly of the duties and the faults of the laity and contains sixteen canons. The little treatise: De Pascha, was composed by Martin in order to explain to his people why Easter is celebrated on variable days the series of which begins with the xi. Kal. Apr. and ends on xi. Kal. Maii. He says that such was the custom handed down from his predecessors. The: Epistola de trina mersione, is addressed to a bishop named Boniface, probably resident among the Visigoths. In it he decries as Sabellian all baptism *sub una mersione,* a custom that had been adopted in Spain in a spirit of opposition to Arianism. Finally, we possess still three short poems or metrical inscriptions composed by Martin. Isidore of Seville says[1] that he wrote also a volumen epistolarum, but it seems to have perished.

2. WORKS ON MARTIN OF BRACARA. OTHER SPANISH WRITERS. — There is no complete edition of the writings of Martin of Bracara. The following are found in *Gallandi* (Bibl. vet. Patr. xii): Formula vitae honestae, Liber de moribus, Pro repellenda iactantia, De superbia, Exhortatio humilitatis, De ira, De pascha, and the metrical inscriptions. *Migne* (PL., lxxii) reprints these works from *Gallandi,* elsewhere he reprints the Verba seniorum (Ib., lxxiii. 1025—1062), Aegyptiorum patrum sententiae (Ib., lxxiv. 381—394), Capitula Martini (Ib., lxxxiv. 574—586; cxxx. 575—588); there are lacking in *Migne:* De correctione rusticorum, Epistola de trina mersione, and De paupertate. All editions of Martin's writings are indicated and described with his usual accuracy by *C. P. Caspari,* Martins von Bracara Schrift «De correctione rusticorum», Christiania, 1883. The work most frequently printed is the Formula vitae honestae. Among the prose works of Seneca edited by *Fr. Haase* (Leipzig, 1852—1853 1893—1895) the reader will find, in an appendix (iii. 458—475), the De paupertate, Liber de moribus, and Formula vitae honestae. The Capitula Martini are found in several collections of councils and canonical documents; cf. *Fr.*

[1] De viris ill., c. 35.

*Maassen,* Geschichte der Quellen und der Literatur des kanonischen Rechts, Graz, 1870, i. 802—806. For a later recensions of the De pascha, among the spurious works of St. Athanasius, cf. § 63, 11. The three metrical inscriptions were included in *R. Peiper's* edition of the works of St. Avitus of Vienne (Monum. Germ. hist. Auct. antiquiss. vi. 2), pp. 194—196. — Among other works of Apringius, bishop of Pace (Badajoz) about 540, Isidore of Seville notes (De viris ill., c. 30) a commentary on the Apocalypse, until recently reputed lost. Quite lately some important fragments of it were discovered. the explanation of the first five and the last five chapters of the Apocalypse, in a manuscript of the University of Copenhagen. They were edited by *M. Férotin:* Apringius de Béja. Son commentaire de l'Apocalypse, Paris, 1900. Cf. *H. L. Ramsay,* Le commentaire sur l'Apocalypse par Beatus de Libana, in Revue d'hist. et de littér. religieuses (1902), vii. 419—447; *F. Fita,* Apringio de Beja, in Boletin de la R. Academia de la Historia (1902), xli. 535—616. *K. Weyman,* Textkritische Bemerkungen zum Apokalypsenkommentar des Apringius, in Biblische Zeitschrift (1903), i. 175—181. — The Liber responsionum ad quemdam Rusticum de interrogatis quaestionibus (doctrinal in contents; in Isid. Hisp., De viris ill., c. 33), written by Justinian, bishop of Valencia († after 546), seems to have perished. *A. Helfferich* identifies it with the Annotationes de cognitione baptismi (*Migne,* PL., xcvi. 111—172), current under the name of St. Ildephonsus of Toledo; cf. *P. B. Gams,* Die Kirchengeschichte von Spanien, Ratisbon, 1864, ii 1, 455. — Justus, bishop of Urgel († after 546), and brother of the aforesaid Justinian, left a brief allegorical commentary on the Canticle of canticles (*Migne,* PL., lxvii. 961 to 994) dedicated to his metropolitan, Sergius of Tarragona; cf. *Gams,* l. c., p. 441. Isidore of Seville adds (l. c., c. 34) the following to his notice of Justus of Urgel: Huius quoque fratres, Nebridius et Elpidius (also bishops, ib., c. 33) quaedam, scripsisse feruntur.

3. ST. ISIDORE OF SEVILLE. — In 585 the Visigothic king, Leovigild, overthrew the Suevic kingdom; thenceforth almost all Spain was subject to the Visigothic rule. What Martin of Bracara had done among the Suevi, was now accomplished among the Visigoths by St. Leander, who was from about 584 till his death (600 or 601) archbishop of Seville. He was at first sent into exile by Leovigild for the prominent part he had taken in the conversion of the king's son, St. Hermenegild. He was also the chief agent in the national conversion of the Visigoths, accomplished (May 589) at the third council of Toledo in the reign of Reccared, successor of Leovigild. Isidore of Seville describes his writings [1], only fragments of which have survived. His anti-Arian works have perished, also his numerous letters, among which were some to Gregory I., with whom he was on terms of intimate friendship. There are now extant only a monastic rule for nuns: Ad Florentinam sororem de institutione virginum et contemptu mundi libellus [2], and a discourse delivered at the close of the aforesaid council: Homilia de triumpho ecclesiae ob conversionem Gothorum; both works are of a character to make us sincerely regret the loss of his other writings. The literary fame of Leander was

[1] De viris ill., c. 41. [2] Ib.

far surpassed by that of Isidore, his younger brother, and successor in the see of Seville († 636). But little is known of his career as a bishop. The last great event of his life was the fourth national council of Toledo, in December 633, over which he presided. He was even then acknowledged to be the most scholarly man of his age and the restorer of learning in Spain. To his own oft-quoted work *De viris illustribus* the following notitia was added after the death of Isidore, by his friend Braulio, bishop of Saragossa (Praenotatio librorum Divi Isidori): quem Deus post tot defectus Hispaniae novissimis temporibus suscitans, credo ad restauranda antiquorum monumenta, ne usquequaque rusticitate veterasceremus, quasi quamdam apposuit destinam[1]. The eighth synod of Toledo (653) says of Isidore: nostri saeculi doctor egregius, ecclesiae catholiciae novissimum decus, praecedentibus aetate postremus, doctrinae comparatione non infimus, et quod maius est, in saeculorum fine doctissimus[2]. Isidore, indeed, possesses and assimilates all the knowledge of his time, while in the quality of his literary labors he far surpasses all Spanish Christian writers of antiquity. He considers it his mission to counteract the spreading barbarism of his surroundings by the diffusion of education and learning; his strenuous efforts in this direction entitle him to the affectionate gratitude, not only of Spain but of the entire West. He felt himself called, like Boethius and Cassiodorius, to collect the remaining intellectual treasures of Roman antiquity and hand them down to the new German society. The influence of Isidore's writings on the European mind during the Middle Ages is simply incalculable. It must be said that they exhibit but little originality. Isidore is less concerned with fresh researches than with the garnering of the scientific inheritance of his intellectual ancestry. When we consider the circumstances of his age, we may rightly wonder at the extent of his erudition and the intensity of his zeal as a compiler. In the following centuries these works, genuine compendia of entire libraries, were all the more highly valued because of the simple and clear style in which they were written. It is only natural that his pages should frequently reveal that decadence of taste which is distinctive of epochs of dissolution and transition. The Latin diction of Isidore is particularly interesting to philologists because of the many Visigothic elements that it contains. His writings furnish the first chapter in the history of Spanish literature. The most extensive and influential of his compilations is the: Etymologiae (Origines), finished by Isidore only a short time before his death, and divided by his friend Braulio, to whom he sent the manuscript for correction, into twenty books. The work is a compendious encyclopedia, in which the subject-matter of universal knowledge is arranged and described in connection with a very bizarre

[1] *Migne*, PL., lxxxi. 16—17. [2] *Mansi*, SS. Conc. Coll., x. 1215.

and fantastic etymology, which circumstance gave the name to the whole. The books are entitled as follows: 1. De grammatica; 2. De rhetorica et dialectica, 3. De quatuor disciplinis mathematicis (arithmetic, geometry, music, astronomy), 4. De medicina; 5. De legibus et temporibus (inclusive of a short universal chronicle to 627); 6. De libris et officiis ecclesiasticis; 7 De Deo, angelis et fidelium ordinibus; 8. De ecclesia et sectis diversis; 9. De linguis, gentibus, regnis, militia, civibus, affinitatibus; 10. Vocum certarum alphabetum (etymologies); 11. De homine et portentis; 12. De animalibus; 13. De mundo et partibus; 14. De terra et partibus; 15. De aedificiis et agris; 16. De lapidibus et metallis; 17. De rebus rusticis; 18. De bello et ludis; 19. De navibus, aedificiis et vestibus; 20. De penu et instrumentis domesticis et rusticis. Very little has hitherto been accomplished for the textual criticism of this much used and variously altered and corrupted work. Modern scholarship has scarcely begun to investigate the number and character of the authorities of Isidore and his manner of utilizing them. The work is largely, almost entirely, a mosaic-like construction, made up of an immense number of excerpts. It is clear that very many of the later Christian and classical works quoted by Isidore were read by him at first hand; this is true even of similar works that are no longer extant. Other earlier writers were known and quoted by Isidore from compilations current in his time. To the mediæval student the Etymologiae, with all their imperfections, were a real mine of information. They furnished the model and much of the material for all mediæval dictionaries. Isidore composed several other works of the same general character. Thus, the: Libri duo differentiarum: De differentiis verborum (a dictionary of synonyms), and De differentiis rerum (brief explanations of theological notions), are companion-works to the first two books of the Etymologiae. In turn, the first book of these Differentiae is further illustrated by two books of *Synonyma,* often called: Liber lamentationum, because of the peculiar manner in which synonyms are set forth. At the request of the Visigoth king Sisebut, our author composed an elementary manual of physics which he entitled: De natura rerum. His work: De ordine creaturarum deals with the phenomena of the spiritual and the physical order. The short universal chronicle in the fifth book of the Etymologiae is taken from an earlier Chronicon that reached to 615; the preface says that it was based on Julius Africanus, Eusebius-Jerome and Victor of Tunnuna. The: Historia de regibus Gothorum, Wandalorum et Suevorum is a chronicle of the Visigoths, with two short chronicle-like appendixes on the history of the Vandals and the Suevi; it is also substantially a compendium of earlier historical works on these subjects, and has reached us in two recensions, a shorter one that stops at the death of Sisebut (621), and a longer one that reaches to the fifth year of his suc-

cessor Suintilas. We have already mentioned (§ 2, 2) a third historical work of Isidore, his continuation of the *De viris illustribus* of St. Jerome. Apropos of this well-known and useful work of literary biography we may enumerate the theological writings of Isidore. Among them the following are worthy of mention: De ortu et obitu patrum qui in Scriptura laudibus efferuntur (a history of the persons prominent in the Old and New Testaments); Allegoriae quaedam Sacrae Scripturae (on the allegorical significance of important personalities of Bible history); Liber numerorum qui in Sanctis Scripturis occurrunt (on the mystical meaning of Scriptural numbers); In libros Veteris et Novi Testamenti prooemia; De Veteri et Novo Testamento quaestiones; Mysticorum expositiones sacramentorum seu quaestiones in Vetus Testamentum (in Genesim, in Exodum, in Leviticum, in Numeros, in Deuteronomium, in Josue, in librum Judicum, in libros Regum, in Esdram, in libros Machabaeorum). Special mention must be made of his little apologetico-polemical treatise: De fide catholica ex Veteri et Novo Testamento contra Judaeos ad Florentinam sororem suam, which book was early in the Middle Ages translated into several European vernaculars, among others into German. The: Libri tres sententiarum, are a kind of manual of dogmatic and moral theology, constructed from the writings of approved ecclesiastical authorities, especially St. Gregory the Great. Of the two books into which his liturgical work: De ecclesiasticis officiis, is divided, the first: De origine officiorum, treats of the divine worship, while the second: De origine ministrorum, treats of the clergy. In his Regula monachorum, Isidore gave proof of his deep concern for the improvement of the monastic life which he held to be the cradle of all learning and the refuge of all scholarship. Only a few of his letters have been preserved. The hymns current under his name are all spurious.

4. WORKS ON ISIDORE OF SEVILLE. OTHER SPANISH WRITERS. — *F. Görres,* Leander, Bischof von Sevilla, in Zeitschr. für wissenschaftl. Theol. (1886), xxix. 36—50. The Monastic Rule and the Discourse of Leander are in *Migne,* PL., lxxii. 874—898. — The best edition of the works of Isidore is that of *Fr. Arevalo,* Rome, 1797—1803, 7 vols. (*Migne,* PL., lxxxi to lxxxiv). *Teuffel-Schwabe,* in Gesch. der röm. Lit., 5. ed., 1295, gives a full account of all works relative to the Etymologiae (researches on manuscript-tradition, special editions of separate sections, and contributions to the textual criticism of the encyclopedia). *H. Dressel,* De Isidori Originum fontibus (Diss. inaug.), Turin, 1874. *G. Mercati,* L'età di Simmaco l'interprete e S. Epifanio, Modena, 1893, pp. 80—87. *H. Schwarz,* Observationes criticae in Isidori Hispaliensis Origines (Progr.), Hirschberg, 1895. The De natura rerum was edited separately by *G. Becker,* Berlin, 1857. The historical writings of Isidore were edited anew by *Th. Mommsen,* Chronica minora saec. iv v vi vii, vol. ii (Monum. Germ. hist. Auct. antiquiss.), Berlin, 1894, xi. 241—303; Isidori Iunioris episc. Hispal. Historia Gothorum, Wandalorum, Sueborum ad a. 624 (pp. 304—390: various supplements); pp. 391—488: Chronica maiora ed. primum a. 615. Chronicorum epitome ed. a. 627 (pp. 489—506: Auctarium chronicorum ma-

iorum ad a. 624, and other additions). *H. Hertzberg,* Über die Chroniken des Isidorus von Sevilla, in Forschungen zur deutschen Geschichte (1875), xv. 289—360. A German version of the Historia de regibus Gothorum, Wandalorum et Suevorum was made by *D. Coste,* Leipzig, 1887 (Die Geschichtsschreiber der deutschen Vorzeit, seventh century, i). *K. Weinhold,* Die altdeutschen Bruchstücke des Traktats des Bischofs Isidorus von Sevilla «De fide catholica contra Iudaeos», Paderborn, 1874. *G. A. Hench,* Der althochdeutsche Isidor, Strassburg, 1893. For the poems current under the name of Isidore see *M. Manitius,* Gesch. der christl.-latein. Poesie, Stuttgart, 1891, pp. 414—420. Apropos of his De ecclesiasticis officiis cf. *Dom Férotin,* Le Liber ordinum, en usage dans l'église wisigotique et mozarabe d'Espagne du V^e^ au XI^e^ siècle. Publié pour la première fois, avec une introduction, des notes, une étude sur neuf calendriers mozarabes etc. (Monumenta Ecclesiae Liturgica, v), Paris, 1904. The life and writings of Isidore are described in detail by *P. B. Gams,* Die Kirchengeschichte von Spanien, Ratisbon, 1874, ii 2, 102—113, and by *A. Ebert,* Allgem. Gesch. der Literatur des Mittelalters im Abendlande, 2. ed., i. 588—602. — There are extant (*Migne,* PL., lxxii. 689—700) three letters of Licinianus, bishop of Carthagena (Carthago Spartaria) on the south-eastern coast of Spain in the time of emperor Maurice (582—602). The second letter maintains the immateriality of the angelic nature. Cf. *Gams,* Die Kirchengeschichte von Spanien, ii 2, 49—55. — Severus, bishop of Malaga and friend and contemporary of Licinian, is said by Isidore (De viris ill., c. 43) to have composed a polemical treatise against Vincentius, the Arian bishop of Saragossa, also a treatise on virginity entitled Annulus and dedicated to his sister. Both works have apparently perished. — There are extant two letters of Eutropius, a bishop of Valencia towards the end of the sixth century (*Migne,* PL., lxxx. 9—20); cf. *Gams,* l. c., pp. 57—59. — In his dissertation entitled Eine Bibliothek der Symbole und theologischer Traktate, Mainz, 1900 (in Forschungen zur christlichen Literatur- und Dogmengeschichte, i. 4), *K. Künstle* made known long extracts from a collection of theological creeds and treatises, that were written in Spain, towards the end of the sixth century, in opposition to the contemporary Priscillianism and Arianism. These documents were preserved in a ninth-century manuscript of the monastery of Reichenau.

---

**Corrections.**

Page 209 line 2 for *wellk-nown* read: *well-known.*
,, 401 ,, 35 ,, *illsuccess* read: *ill success.*
,, 405 ,, 28 ,, betrays *e* certain read: betrays *a* certain.
,, 514 ,, 19 ,, *re*pared in 437 read: *pre*pared in 457.
,, 638 ,, 10 ,, V*i*gilius read: V*ir*gilius.

# INDEX.

(The numbers indicate the pages.)


Abgar, toparch of Edessa 109 251.
Acacius of Beroea 347.
Acacius of Caesarea 239 240.
Acacius of Constantinople 534.
Acacius of Melitene 370.
Achatius (Acacius), Acta disputationis 233.
Acta apostolorum apocrypha, see Apostles (Acts of).
Acta disputationis Archelai et Manetis 268.
Acta Edessena 110.
Acta Martyrum: the oldest genuine Acts 228—233, Martyrium St. Polycarpi 229, Acta St. Carpi, Papyli et Agathonices 230, Acta St. Justini et sociorum 230, Epistola Ecclesiarum Viennensis et Lugdunensis 230, Acta Martyrum Scillitanorum 231, Acta St. Apollonii 231, Acta St. Perpetuae et Felicitatis 232, Acta St. Pionii 233, Acta disputationis St. Achatii 233, Eusebius' Collection of Acts of the Martyrs 228, his work on the contemporary martyrs in Palestine 247 251, Syriac Acts of the Martyrs 393. Other Acts of Martyrs: Acta St. Anastasii Persae 565, St. Gregorii Armeni 591, St. Longini Centurionis 380, St. Luciani 240, St. Martyrum Agaunensium (St. Mauricii et sociorum eius) 518 519, St. Martyrum Carthaginensium 615, St. Martyrum Homeritarum 552, St. Septem dormientium 644 647, St. Pamphili et sociorum 167, St. Rhipsimes et sociarum 591, De martyrio St. Sisinnii, Martyrii et Alexandri 444. See Vita Sanctorum.
Acta (Gesta) Pilati 97.
Ad Laodicenses 111.
Ad quendam senatorem, poem 422 423.
Adamantius 167 (see Origen).
Addaeus, see Thaddaeus.
Addaeus, Doctrina Addaei 110.
Adrian (Hadrian) 379 380.
Adrian II. 657.
Adversus Haereses 119.
Aeneas of Gaza 543.
Aetius 239.
Africanus, see Julius Africanus.
Agapetus of Constantinople 551.
Agapitus I., Pope 640.
Agathangelus 590 591.
Agnellus 527.
Agrapha 93.
Agricola 505.
Agrippa Castor 116.
Alcimus Avitus 609—611.
Alexander of Alexandria 253 263.
Alexander of Jerusalem 164, cp. 127 128
Alexander of Lycopolis 269.
Alexander of Salamina 552.
Alexandrine Catechetical School 127.
Alexandrine Exegetical School 235.
Alexandrinos, Epistola ad 111.
Alfanus of Salerno 306.
Alfred, King of England 511 632 633 653
Alliance (Testament), Old and New 23.
Alphonsus Liguori 3.
Altercatio Heracliani cum Germinio 416.
Altercatio Simonis Judaei et Theophili Christiani 517.
Ambrosiaster 440.
Ambrosius 53.
Ambrosius, friend and patron of Origen 153, cp. 136.
Ambrosius of Alexandria 256.
Ambrosius of Milan, St. 431—444: his life 431, his writings 433, exegetical 433 435, ascetico-moral 436, dogmatic 437, discourses and letters 438, hymns and other poems 439, complete editions, translations of selected works 440, editions, translations and recensions of separate works 440, literature on Ambrosius 442; vita S. Ambrosii 513.
Ammon 265.
Ammonius of Alexandria (3rd century) 60 153.

Ammonius of Alexandria (5th century) 533.
Amoenus 451.
Amphilochius of Iconium 279 286.
Amphilochius of Side 370.
Ananias 593.
Anastasius I., Pope 455.
Anastasius II., Pope 620 621.
Anastasius I. of Antioch, St. 574.
Anastasius II. of Antioch 575.
Anastasius III. of Nicaea 570 571.
Anastasius Apocrisiarius 576 579.
Anastasius Bibliothecarius 561 657.
Anastasius, Hymn-writer 564.
Anastasius Monachus 576 579.
Anastasius Sinaita 133 547 580 581.
Anatolius 157.
Andreas, The Apostle: Gospel of Andreas 96, acts of Andreas 103, later recensions of the Andreas-Legend 104.
Andreas of Caesarea 569.
Andreas of Crete 567.
Andreas of Samosata 370.
Angels: the nine choirs in Pseudo-Dionysius Areopagita 536, corporeal according to Faustus of Riez 601, incorporeal according to Licinianus of Carthagena 664.
Anianus (Annianus) of Celeda 345 504 604.
Anicetus, Pope 36 117.
Anonymi Hermippus 544.
Anonymous, Anti-Arian 416.
Anonymous, Anti-Montanist 123.
Anonymous, Anti-Semipelagian 515.
Anonymous, Montanist 85.
Anonymous, Poet 420.
Anonymus Mellicensis 8.
Anthimus 78.
Anthimus 563.
Anthologia Palatina 290 note.
Anthony, St. 253 264 265.
Anti-Gnostics 116—118.
Anti-Montanists 123.
Antitheses (of Marcion) 80.
Antiochene Exegetical School 235 236.
Antiochus, Monachus 29 573.
Antiochus of Ptolemais 347.
Antiochus of St. Saba 573.
Antipater of Bostra 532.
Antiquorum Patrum doctrina de Verbi Dei incarnatione 547 581.
Antonini Placentini Itinerarium 638.
Antoninus Honoratus 615.
Antonius, supposed poet 449.
Apelles 80 117.
Aphraates 385—387: life 385, works 386, literature on 387.
Aphthartodocetae 533 545.
Aphthonius 596.
Apion 118.
Apocalypse: Johannine authorship rejected by Gaius, defended by Hippolytus 124, rejected by Dionysius of Alexandria 155.
Apocalypses, Apocryphal 113—116: Apocalypse of St. Peter 89 113, Apocalypsis Petri per Clementem 113, Apocalypse of St. Paul 114, Visio S. Pauli 115, Ascension of St. Paul 115, Revelatio Thomae 116, Revelatio Stephani 116, Revelatio Zachariae 116. Apocalypsis Danielis 116.
Apocatastasis: in Origen 152, in Gregory of Nyssa 303 304, in Didymus the Blind 307, in Evagrius Ponticus 308 310, not in St. John Chrysostom 339. See Origenistic controversies.
Apocrypha, New Testament 85 ff: in general 85, Apocryphal Gospels 87 90—97, Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles 88 97—110, Apocryphal Epistles of the Apostles 89 110—113, Apocryphal Apocalypses 89.
Apollinaris of Hierapolis 61.
Apollinaris of Laodicea (Junior) 242—244 289; Apollinarism 242—244; Apollinaristic literature 244.
Apollinaris of Laodicea (Senior) 243.
Apollinaris Sidonius 603 606.
Apollonius, Anti-Montanist 124.
Apollonius, Martyr 231.
Apologetics: the apologetic literature of the second century 44—72, other apologists of the primitive patristic period: Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Dionysius of Alexandria, in the East 126 127 f.; Tertullian, Cyprian, Arnobius, Lactantius, Hippolytus, Commodian, in the West 178; apologetic literature of the second period: among the Greeks 236, among the Syrians 386, among the Latins 398; apologetic literature of the third period: among the Greeks 574, among the Armenians 589 ff, among the Latins 597 f.
Apostles, The Twelve: the Gospel of the Twelve 91, the Doctrine of the Twelve 19—22. See Didache.
Apostles, Epistles of, Apocryphal 110—113: Epistle to the Laodiceans 110, Epistle to the Alexandrines 111, Correspondence of Paul and the Corinthians 111, Correspondence of Paul and Seneca 112.
Apostles, Acts of, Apocryphal 97—110: the Preaching of Peter and the Preaching of Paul 97, Acts of Peter 98, Acts of Paul 100, Acts of Peter and Paul 101, Acts of Paul and Thecla 102, Acts of Andrew 103, Acts of John 105, Acts of Thomas 106, Acts of Philip 108, Acts of Matthew 108, Legend of Thaddaeus 109.
Apostles' Creed 17.
Apostolica Didascalia 168—170; Arabica and Ethiopica 352.
Apostolic Canons 357.

Apostolic Church-Ordinance 160—162.
Apostolic Constitutions 238 349—358: their composition, contents, sources 349, unity of origin, time and place of composition 350, their history 351, editions, translations, recensions 351, the Arabic and Ethiopic Didascalia 352, recensions of the eighth book of the Apostolic Constitutions, the Constitutions per Hippolytum, the Egyptian Church-Ordinance 353, the eighth book of the Apostolic Constitutions (continued), the Testament of our Lord 355, the Canones Hippolyti 356, the recensions of the Apostolic Canons 357.
Apostolic Fathers 15.
Apponius 628.
Apringius of Pace 660.
Apuleius of Madaura 418.
Aquilius Severus 426.
Arabianus 118.
Arator 624.
Archelaus of Carchar 268.
Areopagita, see Dionysius Areopagita.
Arethas of Caesarea 45.
Arethas-Codex 45 64.
Aristides of Athens 46.
Aristo of Pella 48 517.
Arius 238; Arianism and Arian literature 238—240 257 412; Semiarianism and Semiarian literature 240.
Armenian literature 589 590.
Arnobius 201—203.
Arnobius, another 604.
Arnobius Junior 604.
Arsenius 382.
Asarbus 429.
Asclepiades 164.
Asclepiades 208.
Asclepius 615.
Asser 632.
Asterius of Amasea 306.
Asterius the Sophist 239.
Asterius Urbanus 85.
Athanasian Creed 255 261.
Athanasius, St. 253—263: life 253, works: apologetical 254, dogmatic 254, historico-polemical 256, exegetical 257, ascetical 258, festal letters 258, Christology and Trinitarian doctrine 258, complete editions, translations, recensions 260, editions translations, recensions of separate works 261, works on Athanasius 263.
Athenagoras of Athens: life 64, writings 64, characteristics 65.
Athenodorus 175.
Atticus of Constantinople 348, cp. 328 329.
Augustine, St. 473—508: life to his baptism (354—387) 473, after his baptism (387 to 430) 475, Retractationes and Confessiones 477; works: philosophical, apologetical and dogmatic 479, dogmatico-polemical, Anti-Manichaean 481, Anti-Donatist 483, Anti-Pelagian 485, Anti-Arian 488, exegetic-moral and pastoral-theological 488—492, sermons, letters, poems 492, conspectus of his writings 494, philosophy of St. Augustine 496, his theology 498, opposition to Pelagianism 498, complete editions, translations 502; editions, translations, recensions of separate works 502—506, biography and characteristics of Augustine 506, literature on his philosophy 507, on his theology 507.
Aurelianus of Arles 612.
Aurelius of Carthage 510.
Aurelius Prudentius 444—447.
Ausonius 421.
Auspicius of Toul 608.
Auxentius, Archimandrite 563.
Auxentius of Dorostorum 412.
Avellana Collectio 628.
Avitus of Bracara 511.
Avitus of Vienne, St. 609—611.

Bacchyllus of Corinth 126.
Bachiarius 511.
Balaeus 394.
Balsamon 172.
Baptism: according to St. Justin Martyr 56, Tertullian 185 189, St. Cyprian 191, Optatus of Milevi 399 427, St. Augustine 483 486; controversy on Baptism administered by heretics, see Heretical Baptism; Baptism by single immersion condemned by St. Martin of Bracara 659.
Bardesanes 78.
Barnabas, The so-called Epistle of: contents 22, spurious character 23, time and place of composition 24; Gospel of Barnabas 96.
Barsanuphius, St. 551.
Bartholomew, Gospel of 97.
Basil, St., the Great 274—285: his youth 274, monk and priest 275, metropolitan of Caesarea 275, his works: dogmatico-polemical 276, exegetical 277, ascetical 278, homilies, letters, «Liturgy» 279, greatness of Basil 280, his rule of faith 280, Trinitarian doctrine 281, on the cognoscibility of God 282, complete editions 283, editions and recensions of separate works 284, versions 285, literature on St. Basil 285.
Basil of Ancyra 241.
Basilides 73.
Basilius Cilix 553.
Basilius Minimus 293
Basilius, Monk 369.
Basilius of Seleucia 531.
Beatus of Libana 462 471.
Bede the Venerable 471; Pseudo Beda 632.

Bellator 142.
Benedict I., Pope 657.
Benedict of Aniane, St. 283.
Benedict of Nursia 627.
Beron 209 219.
Beryllus of Bostra 165.
Biblical Theology: Biblical text criticism; see Origen, Lucius of Samosata, Hesychius the Egyptian; Biblical commentaries, for the earliest patristic period, see those of Origen, Hippolytus and Victorinus of Pettau; in the second period it is the representatives of the Antiochene school who are most productive in works of exegesis, e. g. Diodorus of Tarsus, Theodore of Mopsuestia, Polychronius, Chrysostom and Theodoret of Gaza; among the Syrians Ephraem represents similar principles of biblical exegesis; most other commentators follow the allegorical method: in the East Eusebius of Caesarea, Athanasius, Gregory of Nyssa, Didymus the Blind, Cyril of Alexandria; in the West Hilary of Poitiers, Jerome, Augustine. For Bible-commentaries of the third period see 530 f. 598 f., also Catenae 529 &c. Bible-translations: Jerome, Vulgate; Biblical Hermeneutics see Hermeneutics; Biblical Introduction, Archæology and Geography are represented by Eusebius of Caesarea, Epiphanius, Jerome, Augustine, Cosmas Indicopleustes, Junilius, Isidore of Seville. See also Pilgrimages.
Bibliothecae Patrum 12.
Blossius Dracontius, see Dracontius.
Boethius 628—632; literature 632.
Bolanus 165.
Bonaventure, St. 497.
Bonifatius I., Pope 514.
Bonifatius II., Pope 640.
Braulio of Saragossa 661.
Breviarius de Hierosolyma 638.
Burgundio of Pisa 306.

Caelestius 487 504.
Caena Cypriani 100.
Caesarius of Arles, St. 611—613.
Caesarius of Nazianzus 294.
Caius 124.
Callinicus 379.
Callisthenes (Pseudo-) 595.
Callixtus, Pope 223, cp. 186 209.
Candidus, Anti-Gnostic 118.
Candidus, Arian 412.
Candidus, Valentinian 148.
Canon, Biblical, according to Theodore of Mopsuestia 319 320. See Apocalypse.
Canons, the so-called Apostolic 357; collections of Canons: Greek 571, Latin 591, Nomocanones 571.
Capitula of St. Hippolytus 124.
Capreolus of Carthage 510.
Carmen adversus paganos 422.
Carmen de providentia divina 514.
Carpus, Papylus and Agathonice 230.
Cassian 515—518.
Cassiodorius 132 141 633—636; literature on 636.
Castor of Apta Julia 516 517.
Catalogus Felicianus 657.
Catalogus Liberianus 423 657.
Catechetical School of Alexandria 127.
Catenae 257 529 535 542 570.
Celsus 147 148.
Cerdon 79.
Cerealis of Castellum 615.
Ceretius of Grenoble 519.
Cerinthus 124.
Chiliasm: in Papias 43, in St. Irenaeus 120, in Nepos 154—155, opposed by Dionysius of Alexandria 155, in Lactantius 204, in Commodianus 227.
Chosrowig 592 593.
Christology: of St. Irenaeus 121, St. Athanasius 258 f., Diodorus of Tarsus 317, Theodore of Mopsuestia 321, St. Chrysostom 340, St. Cyril of Alexandria 317 365, Theodoret of Cyrus 371, Aphraates 386, St. Ephrem 390, St. Hilary 408, Prudentius 445, St. Leo the Great 524, Leontius of Byzantium 545—546, St. Maximus Confessor 576—577. See Logos, Trinitarian Doctrine.
Christus Patiens 290 293.
Chromatius of Aquileia 444.
Chronicles, see Historical Theology.
Chronicon imperiale 514.
Chronicon integrum 513.
Chronicon paschale 555.
Chronicon vulgatum 513.
Chronographer of the year 354: 423.
Chrysologus, St. Peter 526.
Chrysostom, St. John 323—347: life before ordination to priesthood 323, preacher at Antioch 324, patriarch of Constantinople 324, Chrysostom and Eutropius 324, Chrysostom and Eudoxia 325, continuation and end of the Chrysostom-tragedy 327, his works: exegetical homilies 329, other discourses 331, apologetico-moral and ascetico-moral writings 333, letters 336, spurious writings 336, Chrysostom as homilist 337, his doctrine 339, complete editions and editions of separate works 343, translations 345, literature on Chrysostom 346, Vitae S. Johannis Chrysostomi 348 562.
Church, The, concept and essence of: according to St. Ignatius of Antioch 33, St. Cyprian 192, St. Pacian of Barcelona 425, Optatus of Milevi 426, St. Augustine 484 f., relations of Church and State according to St. Ambrose 432,

according to St. Augustine 484; Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction, see Penance; Ecclesiastical Hierarchy: according to St. Clement of Rome 26, St. Ignatius of Antioch 32, Pseudo-Dionysius-Areopagita 536; primacy of the Roman Church: in St. Clement of Rome 27, St. Ignatius of Antioch 33, St. Cyprian 193, Optatus of Milevi 426, St. Jerome 469, St. Leo the Great 523, St. Peter Chrysologus 526, St. Avitus of Vienne 609, Ennodius of Pavia 623.
Church, Doctors of the 2.
Church History, see Historical Theology.
Church, Fathers of the; see Fathers.
Church-Ordinances, the so-called Apostolic 160—162; the Egyptian 353.
Cicero 204 398 436 474 480 629 632.
Claudianus, Poet 383.
Claudianus Mamertus 603.
Claudius Claudianus 383 445 603 607.
Claudius Marius Victor 450.
Clement of Alexandria 127—135: life 127, writings 128: the Protrepticus, Paedagogus. Stromata 129, Hypotyposes 132, Quis dives salvetur 132, works known only by citations and fragments 132, his doctrinal views 133.
Clement of Rome, St. 25—30: life 25, Epistle to the Corinthians 26, the two Epistolae ad Virgines 29; Apocalypsis Petri per Clementem 114; Apostolic Constitutions 238 349 368; Clementinae or Clementines, the so-called 82—84.
Cleobius 112.
Climacus, Johannes 572.
Codex Fuldensis 60.
Codex Vercellensis 417.
Codex Arethae, see Arethas-Codex.
Coelestine I., Pope, St. 514.
Cohortatio ad Gentiles 53.
Collectio Avellana 628.
Collectio Dionysiana 625.
Comma Iohanneum 429.
Commodian: life 225, Instructiones 225, Carmen Apologeticum 226, summary 226.
Consentius 607.
Constantius of Antioch 349.
Constitutions, the so-called Apostolic, see Apostolic Constitutions.
Consubstantial, see Ὁμοούσιος.
Corinthians, Apocryphal Letter to 111.
Coriun (Koriun) 592.
Cornelius, Pope, St. 200 223.
Corpus scriptorum eccles. latinorum 13.
Cosmas Indicopleustes 555 556.
Cosmas Monachus (Junior) 569.
Cosmas Melodos, St. 568.
Creationism, see Soul.
Creed, the Apostles' 17.
Creed, the Athanasian 255 261.
Crescentius 642.
Crisias, poem 641.
Cyprian, St. 190—201: life 190, writings 192, their Ms.-tradition 193, characteristics 193, treatises 194—196, letters 196, spurious writings 198.
Cyprian of Antioch 383.
Cyprian of Gaul 201 419.
Cyril, St., of Alexandria 360—369: life (to 428) 360, the conflict with Nestorianism 361, his work against Julian 362, dogmatico-polemical writings 362, exegetical writings 364, homilies and letters 365, Christology 365, spurious works 366, complete editions, editions of separate works, early translations 367, later translations and recensions 368, literature on Cyril 368, friends and allies of Cyril 369, adversaries of Cyril 370.
Cyril of Jerusalem, St. 271—273: life 271, the Catecheses 271, other writings 273, literature on 273.
Cyril of Scythopolis 557.
Cyrillonas 394.
Cyrus 383.

Dalmatius 369.
Damasus, Pope, St. 421.
Daniel of Raithu 572 573.
David, the Armenian 593.
De Ecclesia, cento 421.
De Evangelio, poem 417.
De Iesu Christo Deo et homine, poem 417.
De Iona, poem 190 420.
De iudicio Domini (De resurrectione mortuorum), poem 190.
De laudibus Domini, poem 419.
De martyrio Macchabaeorum, poem 417.
De monarchia 53.
De morte Peregrini, romance 34.
De Pascha (De ligno vitae, De cruce), poem 417.
De rebaptismate 98 100.
De Sodoma, poem 190 420.
De Verbi incarnatione, cento 421.
De vocatione omnium gentium 515.
Demetrius of Alexandria 136.
Dexter 426.
Diadochus of Photice 382.
Dialogus Athanasii et Zachaei 49.
Dialogus de recta in Deum fide 167.
Dialogus Papisci et Philonis Iudaeorum cum quodam monacho 581.
Dialogus Timothei et Aquilae 49.
Diatessaron 59.
Dictinius 429.
Didache or Doctrine of the Twelve Apostles 19 f.: contents 19, time and place of composition 20, history 20, literature on 21.
Didascalia, The so-called Apostolic 168 to 170; Arabic and Ethiopic Didascalia 352.

Didymus the Blind 307—309: life 307, writings 308, literature on 309.
Diodorus of Tarsus 315—318: life 315, writings 316, doctrine 317 361, literature on 318.
Diognetus, Epistle to 68.
Dionysiana Collectio 625.
Dionysius of Alexandria 153—157: life 153, writings 154, principal treatises, letters 156.
Dionysius Areopagita, The supposed 535 to 541, writings of the Pseudo-Areopagite 535 577, controversy concerning their authorship 537, actual state of the question 539.
Dionysius Exiguus 357 625 626.
Dionysius of Corinth 125.
Dionysius, Pope, St. 224, cp. 155.
Dioscurus of Alexandria 371 376.
Doctrina Addaei 109.
Dogma: in general the dogmatic literature of Christian Antiquity serves an apologetic or polemical purpose, and does not exceed the limits of the doctrine in question; see Apologetics. The earliest systematization of dogma dates from Origen, Theognostus of Alexandria and Lactantius; a complete system of ecclesiastical dogma produced by St. John of Damascus 584; compendious accounts of Christian doctrine prepared by Theodoret of Cyrus 237 374, St. Augustine 399 481, St. Fulgentius of Ruspe 598 617.
Dogma, History of 5.
Domninus 126.
Domnulus 624.
Donatism 426.
Donatus of Casae Nigrae 426.
Donatus the Great 426.
Dorotheus, Abbot 573.
Dositheus 73.
Dracontius 618—620.
Duae Viae 161.

Easter Controversies 119 122 125 126; Brito-Roman Controversy 157.
Ebionites 81.
Ebionites, Gospel of 81 91.
Edessa, School of 384.
Egyptian Church Ordinance 354.
Egyptians, Gospel of 92.
Elkesaites 81.
Eleutherus (Eleutherius), Pope, St. 117 118 119 125.
Eleutherus (Eleutherius) of Tournay, St. 612.
Elias of Crete 289.
Elische, St. 594.
Elpidius, Bishop 660.
Elpidius (Helpidius), Poet 624.
Elxai, Book of 81.
Encratites 81 92.
Endelechius 449.
Ennodius of Pavia 622.
Ephraem of Antioch 551.
Ephraem Syrus, St. 387—393: life 387, works: their preservation 388, prose writings or biblical commentaries 388, metrical writings or discourses and hymns 389, the Roman edition of the works of Ephraem, additions to the same, translations into German 391—393, literature on Ephraem 393.
Epiphanes 76.
Epiphanius, St., of Constantia 310—314: life 310, works: polemical 312, biblico-archeological 313, spurious 313, letters 313, works on Epiphanius 313, editions, translations and recensions 314.
Epiphanius Scholasticus 532 557 636.
Epistola ad Demetriadem 515 525.
Epistola ad Diognetum 68.
Epistola ad Zenam et Serenum 54.
Epitomes, Clementine 83.
Erasmus 7 435.
Eschatology of Origen 152; of St. Gregory of Nyssa 302—304. See Apocatastasis, Resurrection, Chiliasm.
Etheria 425.
Eucharist, The Blessed: in St. Justin Martyr 56, in St. Cyprian 197, in Eusebius of Caesarea 248, in St. Cyril of Jerusalem 272, in St. Chrysostom (Doctor Eucharistiae) 341 342, in Balaeus 395, in St. John Damascene 585.
Eucherius of Lyons, St. 518 519.
Eudocia, Empress 383.
Eudoxia, Empress 325 328.
Eugenius of Carthage 615.
Eugenius II. of Toledo 619.
Eugippius Abbas 626.
Eulogius of Alexandria 575.
Eunomius of Cyzicus 239 240.
Euphronius of Autun 520.
Eusebius of Alexandria 370.
Eusebius of Caesarea 245—252: life 245, works: historical 246 378, exegetical 241 247, apologetical 248, dogmatic, letters, homilies, complete editions, translations, literature on Eusebius 249, editions and recensions of separate writings 250 252.
Eusebius of Dorylaeum 525.
Eusebius of Emesa 241.
Eusebius of Nicomedia 239.
Eusebius of Thessalonica 575.
Eusebius of Vercellae (Vercelli), St. 417.
Eustathius Afer 285.
Eustathius of Antioch, St. 246 252.
Eustathius of Epiphania 552.
Eustathius Monachus 548.
Eustathius of Sebaste 276 286.
Eustratius of Constantinople 561.
Euthalius 535.

Eutherius of Tyana 375.
Eutropius of Valencia 664.
Eutyches 522 526.
Eutychianism (Monophysitism) 522.
Eutychius of Constantinople 561.
Evagrius of Antioch 258.
Evagrius of Gaul 517.
Evagrius Ponticus 309 310.
Evagrius Scholasticus 554.
Evodius of Uzalum 104.
Exegesis, see Biblical Theology.
Exegetical school of Alexandria 235.
Exegetical school of Antioch 235 236.
Exhortatio poenitendi, poem 565.
Expositio fidei seu De Trinitate 54.
Eznik 593.

Fabian, Pope, St. 223.
Facundus of Hermiane 618 638.
Faith: source and rule of the true Faith according to St. Irenaeus 120, Faith and Knowledge according to Clement of Alexandria 134, Rule of Faith in St. Basil 280, proximate rule of Faith according to St. Jerome 469, Faith and Knowledge according to St. Augustine 497, the Catholic rule of Faith according to Vincentius of Lerins 531.
Fastidius 5.
Fastidius 505.
Fathers of the Church, Ecclesiastical Writers, Doctors of the Church 2; their period 4; repertories of patristic literature 9—11; complete editions of the Fathers 12; general collections of translations 13.
Faustinus 414.
Faustus of Riez (Regi) 600—603: life 600, writings 548 600, literature on 602.
Felix I., Pope, St. 224.
Felix III., Pope 621.
Felix IV., Pope 640 657.
Felix, Abbot 640.
Ferrandus, see Fulgentius Ferrandus.
Ferreolus of Uzès 650.
Festal Letters 156 258.
Filioque, The: in St. Basil the Great 282, in St. Gregory of Nazianzus 292. See Holy Ghost.
Firmicus Maternus 401 402.
Firmilian of Caesarea (Cappadocia) 175
Firmus of Caesarea 370.
Flavian of Antioch 316 318.
Flavian of Constantinople 525.
Flavius Philostratus 249 252.
Florentius 413.
Florinus 77 122.
Fortunatianus of Aquileia 407.
Fortunatus (Venantius) 647—650, cp. 599.
Fronto of Cirta 71.
Fulgentius Ferrandus 616 618 639.
Fulgentius of Ruspe, St. 548 616—618.

Gaianites 575.
Gallus, St. 643.
Gaudentius of Brescia 431.
Gelasian Sacramentary 621 622.
Gelasius I., Pope, St. 422 620 621.
Gelasius of Caesarea 274.
Gelasius of Cyzicus 534.
Generationism, see Soul.
Gennadius of Constantinople 533.
Gennadius of Marseilles 8 608 609.
George 563.
George 589.
George II. of Alexandria 562.
George of Laodicea 241.
George of Lapathus 557.
Georgius Pisides 565 566.
Germanus of Constantinople, St. 304 581 582.
Germanus of Paris, St. 650.
Gerson, John 632.
Gesta Pilati 97.
Gilbert de la Porrée 632.
Gildas Sapiens 637.
Gnostic literature 72 f.: introductory remarks 72, Basilides and Isidore 73, the Ophites or «Agnostics» 74, the Carpocratians 76, Valentine and the Valentinians 76, Bardesanes and Harmonius 78, Marcion and Apelles 79, the Encratites 81.
God, Etymology of, in St. Gregory of Nyssa 301; divine unity proved from reason by Athenagoras 65; natural knowledge of God according to Tertullian 183; existence of God proved from reason by St. Augustine 496 497; how man may know God, according to St. Basil 282. See Trinity.
Gondophares 107.
Gospel-harmonies: of Tatian 59, of Ammonius of Alexandria 60, of Eusebius of Caesarea 248.
Gospels, Apocryphal 87 90; a papyrus-fragment 90; Gospel of the Hebrews 87 90, Gospel of the Twelve and the Gospel of the Ebionites 81 87 91, Gospel of the Egyptians 92, Gospel of Peter 93, Gospels of Matthias, of Philip, of Thomas 94, The Proto-Gospel (Protevangelium) of James 87 95, Gospel of Andrew, of Barnabas, of Bartholomew 96, origins of the Pilate-literature 97, Gospel of Apelles 80 87, Gospel of Basilides 73 87, Gospel of Judas 74, Gospel of Marcion 80, Gospel according to Mary (Magdalen?) 75, Gospel of Nicodemus 97, Gospel of Truth 87.
Gottfried of Auxerre 632.
Grace: according to the Pelagians 485; the doctrine of St. Jerome 465, of St. Augustine 498 f., of St. Prosper of Aquitaine 512, of St. Fulgentius of Ruspe

618; the Semi-Pelagian doctrine of Johannes Cassianus 517, of Vincentius of Lerins 521, of Faustus of Riez (Reji) 601. See Original Sin.
Gratian, Emperor 430 437.
Gregentius, St. 551.
Gregory of Antioch 554.
Gregory of Eliberis (Elvira) 415.
Gregory of Girgenti, St. 561.
Gregory Illuminator, St. 590 591.
Gregory the Great, Pope, St. 650—657: life 650, writings 652, general view of his writings 654, complete and partial editions, translations, recensions 655, literature on Gregory 656.
Gregory of Nazianzus, St., the Theologian 286—294: before his ordination to the priesthood 274 275 286; priest and bishop 287, at Constantinople 287, his discourses 288, letters and poems 289, character 290, Trinitarian doctrine 291, complete editions of his works 292, new editions and recensions of separate works 292, ancient commentaries on his homilies and poems 293, translations of Gregory 294, literature on Gregory 294.
Gregory of Nyssa, St. 295—306: life 295, works: exegetical 296, dogmatico-speculative 297, ascetical 299, homilies and letters 299, theological importance of Gregory 300, Trinitarian doctrine 300, Gregory on the Resurrection 302, and the future life 304, editions of Gregory 304, translations 304, spurious writings 305 306, literature on 306.
Gregory Thaumaturgus, St. 170—175: life 170, writings 171, works: genuine 171, doubtful 173, spurious 174.
Gregory of Tours, St. 643—647.
Gundaphorus 107.

Hadrian, see Adrian.
Harmonius 78.
Hebrews, Gospel of the 87 90.
Hegemonius 268.
Hegesippus 116.
Hegesippus, The so-called 423
Helpidius (Elpidius) 624.
Henry, Pseudo-Henry of Ghent 8.
Heraclas of Alexandria 136—137.
Heracleon 77 78 98.
Heraclianus, Anti-Arian 416.
Heraclianus of Chalcedon 551.
Heraclitus 118.
Heresy: rejected as such by Tertullian 184, histories of heresy by St. Justin Martyr 52, Pseudo-Tertullian 190, St. Hippolytus 208 213, St. Epiphanius 312, Theodoret 373, Philastrius 430, St. Augustine 481, Anastasius Sinaita 580, St. Germanus of Constantinople 581, St. John of Damascus 584, the author of Praedestinatus 604, Liberatus of Carthage 641. See the work on reconciliation of heretics by Timotheus of Constantinople 575. Relation of Patrology to heretical literature 5.
Heretical Baptism i. e. Baptism administered by heretics: controversy concerning 191 f., invalid according to Tertullian 185 189, and the Donatists 426 483, S. Cyprian 191 198, valid according to Pope St. Stephen 191, the author of De rebaptismate 199, Optatus of Milevi 427, St. Augustine 483. (On Dionysius of Alexandria 157.)
Hermas, The Shepherd of 38—43: contents 38, origin 39, history 41, tradition and editions 41, latest literature on the «Shepherd» 42.
Hermeneutics, Biblical: manuals by Adrianus 237 379, St. Augustine 400 488, exposition of biblical phraseology by Pseudo-Melito 63, Tichonius 471, St. Eucherius of Lyons 518, hermeneutical principles of Origen 146, of the Alexandrine school 235, of the Antiochene school 235, Diodorus of Tarsus 317, Theodore of Mopsuestia 320, St. John Chrysostom 338, Theodoret of Cyrus 373, St. Isidore of Pelusium 379, St. Ephraem Syrus 389, St. Hilary of Poitiers 407, St. Ambrose 435, St. Jerome 463, St. Augustine 490, Victor of Antioch 535.
Hermias 69.
Hermippus, dialogue 544.
Hermogenes 184.
Hero of Antioch 30.
Hesychius, bishop 160.
Hesychius of Egypt 160.
Hesychius of Jerusalem 238 377 380 381.
Hesychius of Miletus 554 555.
Hexapla 139 140.
Hierakas 160.
Hierarchy, Ecclesiastical, see Church.
Hierocles, Grammarian 557.
Hierocles, Procurator of Bithynia 248.
Hieronymus, St. 455—473: life (to 379) 455, at Constantinople and Rome (329—385) 456, at Bethlehem (386—420) 458, translates the Scriptures 459, other exegetical works 248 461, historical writings 246 463, dogmatico-polemical 464, letters and homilies 465, scholarship 467, witness to Faith of the Church 468, master of Christian prose 469, complete editions, translations 470, editions, translations, recensions of separate works 470, literature on Hieronymus 473
Hieronymus of Jerusalem 377.
Hierotheus 541.
Hilarianus 453.
Hilarius, Poet 417.
Hilarius, Pope 603 621.
Hilarius of Arles 241 519.

Hilarius of Gaul 417.
Hilary of Poitiers, St. 402—411: life 402, de Trinitate 404, style 404, historico-polemical works 405, exegetical works 407, hymns 408, Christological doctrine 408, complete editions, editions of separate works, translations, recensions 410, literature on Hilary 411, Vita S. Hilarii Pictav. 649.
Hilary of Provence 511.
Hilary of Rome 415.
Hippolytus, St. 208—219: life 208, works: Philosophumena 212, apologetic and dogmatic 215, exegetical and homiletic 216 581, chronographical, canonical 219, odes 219, spurious writings 219, Canones Hippolyti 356, Constitutiones per Hippolytum 354.
Historia monachorum in Egypto 381.
Historical Theology: a general history of the Church was unknown to the first three centuries; first cultivated by the Greeks: Eusebius of Caesarea, Socrates, Sozomen, Theodoret, Philostorgius, Philippus Sidetes, Hesychius of Jerusalem, Timotheus of Berytus, Theodorus Lector, Zacharias Rhetor, Evagrius Scholasticus. Much less was accomplished by the Latin writers: Rufinus, St. Sulpicius Severus, Orosius, Cassiodorius. Ecclesiastical history among the Latins soon degenerated into mere chronicles: St. Hieronymus, St. Prosper of Aquitaine, Hydatius, Marcellinus Comes, Cassiodorius, Victor of Tunnuna, Johannes of Biclaro, Marius of Avenches. Greek Chronicles were written by Eusebius of Caesarea and the author of the Chronicon Paschale; Johannes of Nikiu probably wrote in Coptic. Ecclesiastical histories of particular peoples or countries composed by Cassiodorius, St. Gregory of Tours, St. Isidore of Seville, Moses of Chorene; Histories of Councils by Sabinus of Heraclea, Anastasius Sinaita, St. Germanus of Constantinople. For histories of heresies see Heresy. Histories of theological literature by St Hieronymus, Gennadius of Marseilles, St. Isidore of Seville. For lives of saints see Vitae Sanctorum. For acts of martyrs see Acta martyrum. Philosophy and History treated by St. Augustine 479.
Holy Ghost: His distinct personality denied by Lactantius 204, divinity denied by Macedonians 240, denied by Eunomians 277 297, defended by St. Athanasius 255 260, St. Basil the Great 277 281, St. Gregory of Nazianzus 288 292, St. Gregory of Nyssa 298 299 302, Didymus the Blind 308, St. Ambrose 437, St. Jerome 465, Faustus of Riez (Reji) 600, Paschasius Diaconus 600. Procession of the Holy Ghost according to St. Athanasius 260, St. Gregory of Nazianzus 292, St. Gregory of Nyssa 302.
Homerites (Himjarites) 551.
Homiletics and Catechetics: manuals of St. Augustine 400 492, eminent homilists and catechists 238 400 531 599, comparison of St. Chrysostom and St. Augustine 338.
Homilies, Clementine, see Clementinae.
Homoousia of the Son with the Father, see *Ὁμοούσιος*.
Honoratus of Arles, St. 518.
Honoratus of Constantia 615.
Honoratus of Marseilles 520.
Honorius of Augustodunum (Autun) 8.
Hormisdas, Pope, St. 548 621.
Hosius of Cordova 412.
Hydatius, chronicler 614.
Hydatius of Emerita 429 430.
Hymenaeus of Jerusalem 165.
Hypatius, Abbot 379.
Hypotyposes of Clement of Alexandria 129.

Ibas of Edessa 370.
Idacius, see Hydatius.
Ignatius of Antioch, St. 30—35: tradition of Seven Epistles 30, contents 32 33, genuineness 34, spurious epistles 30 245.
Ildephonsus of Toledo, St. 8 660.
In Genesin ad Leonem papam, poem 417.
Innocent I., Pope, St. 514.
Innocentius of Maronia 546.
Irenaeus of Lyons, St. 118—123: life 118, Adversus haereses 119, other works 122.
Isaac the Great 369 370 591 592.
Isaac, a convert Jew 441.
Isaac of Antioch, St. 396 397.
Isaac of Ninive, St. 397.
Isaias, abbot 268.
Isidore of Cordova 511.
Isidore, a Gnostic 74.
Isidore, St., of Pelusium 379 380.
Isidore of Seville, St. 8 641 660—664.
Itacius (?) 429.
Itala Version, Old (Codex Vercellensis) 417.
Ithacius of Ossonoba 429.
Itinerarium a Burdigala Hierusalem usque 400 424.
Itinerarium Antonini Placentini 638.

Jacobus, see Protevangelium Jacobi.
Jacobus of Edessa 542.
Jacobus of Nisibis 385 391.
Jerome, see Hieronymus.
Jeu, Books of 75.
Jexai, Book of 81.
Job, bishop 245 551.
Job, monachus 551.
Johannes, The Apostle, see Apocalypse.

Johannes, Acts of 105; Historia ecclesiastica de Johanne Apostolo et Evangelista 106.
Johannes II., Pope 640.
Johannes III., Pope 657.
Johannes, disciple of St. Epiphanius 313.
Johannes of Antioch, chronicler 554 555.
Johannes of Antioch, patriarch 362 370.
Johannes of Biclaro 637.
Johannes Burgundio 306.
Johannes Cassianus 515—518.
Johannes of Carpathus 573.
Johannes Chrysostomus, St. see Chrysostom.
Johannes Climacus, St. 572.
Johannes of Damascus, St. 582—589: office and importance 582, life 583, works: dogmatic 583, polemical 585, exegetic and historic 587, homilies 588, literature 588; poetry 568.
Johannes Diaconus 656.
Johannes the Faster (Nesteutes) 571.
Johannes II. of Jerusalem 311 315.
Johannes of Majuma 541.
Johannes Malalas 554 555.
Johannes Mandakuni 594.
Johannes Maxentius 548.
Johannes Monachus 563.
Johannes Monachus (junior) 569.
Johannes Moschus, St. 559 560.
Johannes of Nikiû 555 570.
Johannes Notarius 370.
Johannes Philoponus 544.
Johannes of Raithu 572.
Johannes Scholasticus 571.
Johannes of Scythopolis 551.
Johannes Trithemius 8.
John of Tambach 632.
Jordanis 637.
Josephus Flavius 423 454.
Josephus Hymnographus 565.
Jovinian 465 472.
Judaistic Literature 81—85: Ebionites 81, Elcesaites 81, the so-called Clementines 82.
Judas 109.
Judas, Gospel of 74.
Iudicium secundum Petrum (Iudicium Petri) 161.
Julian the Apostate 234 254 390.
Julian of Eclanum 339 485 486 504.
Julian of Halicarnassus 533.
Julianists (Aphthartodocetae) 533 545.
Julianus Pomerius 612.
Julius I., Pope, St. 253 264.
Julius Africanus 162—164: life 162, Chronographia 163 246, κεστοί, «Embroidered Girdles» 163, letters 164, dubious and spurious writings 164 662.
Julius Cassianus 81 92.
Julius Hilarianus 453.
Junilius 642.
Justin Martyr, St. 49—57: life 49, writings 49, the two Apologies 50, Dialogue with the Jew Trypho 51, lost writings 52, spurious works 54, the genuine writings 55; Acta SS. Justini et Sociorum 230.
Justinian, Emperor 549 550.
Justinian of Valencia 660.
Justus of Urgel 660.
Juvencus 419.

Koriun 392. See Moses of Chorene.

Labubna 109.
Lactantius 203—208: life 203, works 203, Divinae Institutiones 204, Epitome div. inst., De opificio Dei, De ira Dei 206, De mortibus persecutorum 206, De ave Phoenice 207, spurious poems 207, lost writings 208, fragments 208.
Lampridius 607.
Laodicenses, Epistola ad 111.
Lapsi, treatment of the 191 197 220.
Latronianus 429.
Laurentius Mellifluus 624.
Laurentius of Milan 624.
Laurentius of Novara 624.
Lazarus of Pharp 595.
Leander of Seville, St. 660.
Leo I., Pope, St. 522—526: life 522, writings 523, literature on 525.
Leo, poet 607.
Leo the Isaurian 582.
Leonidas 104.
Leontius of Arles 603.
Leontius of Byzantium 245 544—547.
Leontius of Naples (Neapolis) 561.
Leontius of Rome 561.
Leporius, monk 510.
Leucius (Leucius Charinus) 88 99 104.
Liber Pontificalis 657.
Liberatus of Carthage 641.
Liberius, Pope 264.
Licinianus of Carthagena 664.
Liturgies: Liturgy of St. Basil the Great 280 284, of St. John Chrysostom 337 344, Ethiopic Oratio Eucharistica Sancti Ioannis Chrys. 337 344. See Liturgy of the so-called Apostolic Constitutions (VIII, 6—15) 349.
Logia Iesu 92.
Logos, the: λόγος σπερματικός in St. Justin Martyr 56, Procession of the Logos in Tatian 58. See Christology.
Lucian of Samosata, a satirist 34.
Lucian of Samosata, a priest 165 238; Syllucianists 239.
Lucianus of Kaphar Gamala 511.
Lucidus 600 602.
Lucifer of Calaris 413.
Lucius I., Pope, St. 224.
Lucretius 202.
Lupus of Troyes, St. 520.

Macarius, St., the Alexandrine 266 267.
Macarius, St., the Egyptian 266 267 382.
Macarius Magnes 376 377.
Macedonianism 240.
Macedonius 240.
Macrobius 427.
Malalas 554.
Malchion of Antioch 165.
Mamertus, Claudianus 603.
Mani 237.
Manichaeism 237 268 482; its Greek opponents in the second Patristic period 268—271.
Marcellinus 414.
Marcellinus Comes 637.
Marcellus of Ancyra 241 242 249; Sabellianism 241 242.
Marcianus 563.
Marcion 79 117.
Marcus Diaconus 347.
Marcus Diadochus 382.
Marcus Eremita 382.
Maria, The Blessed Virgin: spurious correspondence with St. Ignatius of Antioch 31 32, Mariology of St. Irenaeus 121, sinlessness of Mary, according to St. Ephraem Syrus 391, virginity of Mary according to the same 391, according to St. Jerome 465, Mary Mother of God according to St. Ephraem Syrus 344, the term θεοτόκος in Pierius of Alexandria (?) 158, in Alexander of Alexandria 263; Theodore of Mopsuestia rejects this term 321, likewise Nestorius 361, it is defended by St. Cyril of Alexandria 361 366, opposed first, but afterwards accepted by Theodoret of Cyrus 374; Assumption of the Blessed Virgin according to Modestus of Jerusalem 566, according to St. John of Damascus 588.
Maria of Cassobola 30.
Maria Magdalena (?): Gospel according to Maria 75, little Questions of Maria 75.
Marius of Avenches 637.
Marius Mercator 508 626.
Marius Victor 450.
Marius Victorinus 410.
Marriage, second, according to Tertullian 186 187; marriage and virginity: according to St. Methodius of Olympus 176, St. Ambrose 437, St. Jerome 465, St. Augustine 492.
Martin of Bracara (Braga), St. 658—660.
Martin of Tours, St. 451 452 608 643; Vitae Sancti Martini 452 608.
Martyrium Colbertinum 31.
Martyrologies, Anonymous Syriac 393, of Pseudo-Hieronymus 464 472.
Martyrs, Acts of, see Acta Martyrum.
Maruthas of Maipherkat 394.
Maternus, see Firmicus.
Matthew, The Apostle, St., Acts of 108.
Matthew of Cracow 632.
Matthias, The Apostle, St., Gospel of 94; traditions of 94.
Maxentius 548.
Maximinus 412.
Maximus, Anti-Gnostic 118.
Maximus, bishop 522.
Maximus of Bostra 165.
Maximus Confessor, St. 123 133 576.
Maximus Planudes 633.
Maximus of Turin, St. 527.
Melito of Sardes 62.
Memnon of Ephesus 369.
Memorabilia of Hegesippus 116.
Menander 73.
Mennas of Constantinople 564.
Mercator 508—510.
Mesrop 591 592.
Methodius of Olympus, St. 175—178: life 175, works 176, writings preserved in Greek 176, Slavonic versions 177, lost writings 177, spurious writings 178.
Miltiades, Pope, St. 225.
Miltiades, Apologist 61.
Minucius Felix 70—72: the dialogue Octavius 70, author and time of composition 71, the work De fato 72.
Miro 658.
Modestus, Anti-Gnostic 118.
Modestus of Jerusalem 566.
Monophysitism 522 641.
Monotheletism 564.
Montanistic Literature 85, Anti-Montanists 85 123.
Monum. Germ. Hist. (Auct. Antiquiss.) 13.
Moral Theology, see Practical Theology.
Moschus, see St. Iohannes Moschus.
Moses of Chorene 594.
Moses of Chorene (Pseudo-) 595.
Muratorian Fragment 111 114 220.
Murmellius 632.
Musaeus of Marseilles 606.
Musanus 118.
Musonius 131.
Mutianus 345.

Naassenes 92.
Narcissus of Jerusalem 126.
Nebridius 660.
Nectarius of Constantinople 324 347.
Nemesius of Emesa 306.
Nepos 154.
Nestorius 361 f. 369; Nestorianism 361 641.
Nexocharides, alias Xenocharides 104.
Nicephorus of Antioch 562.
Nicephorus Callistus 552.
Nicephorus of Constantinople 249.
Nicetas of Aquileia 443.
Nicetas of Dacia 443. See Nicetas of Remesiana.
Nicetas David 294.

Nicetas of Nicaea 552.
Nicetas of Remesiana 440 442.
Nicetas of Serrae (Heraclea) 293 571.
Nicetius of Trier 650.
Nicholas, Bishop of Methone 543.
Nicodemus: Evangelium Nicodemi 97.
Nicolaus 73.
Nicomedians, Letter to 125.
Nilus, St. 381 382.
Noetus of Smyrna 213.
Nomocanones 571 572.
Nonnus, Abbas 293.
Nonnus of Panopolis 244.
Notitia Provinciarum et Civitatum Africae 615.
Notitiae Episcopatuum 557.
Notker Labeo 632.
Novatian 220—222: life 220, writings 221, De Trinitate, De cibis iudaicis 221, Tractatus de libris St. Scripturarum 222, Novatianism 191 197 220 425.

Obitus Baebiani, poem 449.
Ode to Sophia 107.
Oecumenius of Tricca 520.
Olympiodorus of Alexandria 569 570.
Olympius 430.
Ὁμοούσιος (ὁ υἱὸς, τῷ πατρί): rallying cry of orthodox Christians in the Arian controversy 239 240, abandoned by Pope Liberius 264, is not found in Alexander of Alexandria 263, nor in Eusebius of Caesarea 245, nor in St. Cyril of Jerusalem 271.
Optatus of Mileve, St. 125 426 427.
Opus imperfectum in Matthaeum 337.
Oratio ad Gentiles 53.
Orders, Rules of 265 278 599.
Orientius 451.
Origen: life and labors 136—153, writings: biblico-exegetical 140, general view of his biblical works 146, writings against pagans and Jews 147, against heretics 148, dogmatic writings 148, works of edification and homilies 149, letters 150, dubious writings 151, philosophico-theological views 151; Tractatus Origenis de libris SS. Scripturarum 222.
Origenistic controversies 127 152 159 236 311 313 453 458 465 530 549 551 558.
Original Sin: denied by Theodore of Mopsuestia 321, and the Pelagians 486 498, doctrine of St. Augustine 498 ff., controversy between St. Augustine and Julianus of Eclanum, on the doctrine of St. Chrysostom 339.
Orosius 510 511.
Orsisius (Orsiesius) 266.

Pacatus 449.
Pachomius, St., abbot 265.
Pachomius, bishop 160.
Pacian of Barcelona, St. 425.
Paedagogus of Clement of Alexandria 129.
Palladius 133.
Palladius 348 381.
Pamphilus of Caesarea 127 166.
Pantaenus 127 128 133.
Papa of Seleucia 387.
Papias of Hierapolis 43.
Pappus 596.
Papyrus Brucianus 75 76.
Papyrus-fragment 90.
Parmenian 426.
Paschal Chronicle 555.
Paschasius Diaconus 600 602.
Paschasius, a monk 659.
Passiones Martyrum, see Acta Martyrum.
Pastor (of Hermas), see Shepherd of Hermas.
Pastor, bishop 430.
Pastoral Theology, see Practical Theology.
Patrick, St. 631.
Patripassianism: its defender Praxeas opposed by Tertullian 185, Noetus of Smyrna opposed by St. Hippolytus 213, defended by Commodianus 227. See Sabellianism.
Patristics 5.
Patrologiae Cursus Completus 12.
Patrology: concept and scope 1—7, history and literature 7—10.
Paul, The Apostle, St., Apocryphal Epistles of: the Epistle to the Laodiceans 110, correspondence with Corinthians 111, with Seneca 112, Apocalypse of Paul 114, Visio S. Pauli 115, Ascension of St. Paul 115, Pauli Praedicatio 98, Acta Pauli 100, Acts of Paul and Thecla 102, Acts of Peter and Paul 101.
Paul of Samosata 165.
Paulinus of Aquileia, St. 283 491.
Paulinus of Biterrae (Béziers) 450.
Paulinus of Burdigala (Bordeaux) 602.
Paulinus of Milan 514.
Paulinus of Nola, St. 447—449.
Paulinus of Pella 608.
Paulinus of Petricordia 608.
Paulus of Callinicus 547.
Paulus Diaconus 656.
Paulus of Elusa 558.
Paulus of Emesa 370.
Paulus of Nisibis 642.
Paulus Orosius 510.
Paulus of Pannonia 604.
Paulus of Samosata 165.
Paulus Silentiarius 543.
Paulus of Tella 139.
Pelagius I., pope 657.
Pelagius II., pope 657.
Pelagius, heresiarch 485 491 504 642; Pelagianism 321 399 495 481; litera-

ture on 504 514; Semipelagianism 512 515; chiefly in Southern Gaul 398.
Penance, post-baptismal means of salvation: in Hermas 39, in Tertullian (Catholic period) 186, in St. Pacianus 429; Canonical Penance, penitential stations in Hermas 39; Pope Callistus remits rigor of penitential discipline, opposition of Hippolytus 210, of Tertullian (Montanist period) 186; treatment of the Lapsi 191 197 220.
Peregrinatio ad Loca Sancta 424.
Peregrinus 428.
Perpetua and Felicitas 232.
Perpetuus of Tours 608.
Peter, the Apostle, St.: Gospel 93, Apocalypse 113; Apocalypsis Petri per Clementem 114, Praedicatio Petri 97, Circuitus (missionary preaching) Petri 82 83, Preaching of Simon Magus in the City of Rome 99, Iudicium secundum Petrum 161, Acts of Peter 98, Actus Petri 99, Acts of Peter and Paul 101.
Petronius of Bologna 418.
Petronius of Verona 418.
Petrus Chrysologus, St. 3 526.
Petrus Damiani, St. 3 283.
Petrus Diaconus 548.
Petrus Mongus 534.
Petrus, poet 607.
Petrus of Alexandria 159.
Petrus II. of Alexandria 255.
Petrus of Laodicea 570.
Petrus Lombardus 584.
Petrus of Sebaste 295 296 297.
Phantasiastae 533.
Philastrius (Philaster), St. 430.
Phileas of Thmuis 160.
Philip, The Apostle, St.: Gospel 94, Acts 108, Syriac Legend of Philip 108.
Philippus, Gnostic 79.
Philippus of Gortynia 118.
Philippus, Presbyter 471.
Philippus Sidetes 117 238 377 378.
Philo of Alexandria 398 431 436 442.
Philo of Carpasia 313 315.
Philocalus, calligrapher 421 423.
Philoponus 544.
Philosophumena, see Hippolytus 209 212.
Philostorgius 239 378.
Philostratus 249.
Phoebadius of Agen 415.
Photinus of Sirmium 242.
Photius 124 134.
Pierius of Alexandria 158.
Pilate-Literature, origins of 97.
Pilgrim-Narratives 424.
Pinytus of Cnossus 125.
Pionius 233.
Pisides 566 567.
Pistis Sophia 75.
Plinius 607.
Poema coniugis ad uxorem 514.
Poetry, Ecclesiastical, origins of: in Clement of Alexandria 129, St. Hippolytus (?) 219, St. Methodius 176, earliest traces of Latin Christian poetry in Commodian 178 225 226, principal Christian poets of the Greeks (second patristic period) 238 529 531, of the Latins 400 599, of the Syrians 389 390 393 394, the hymn as expression of the new Christian lyrical temperament 400 526, the new rhythmic form of poetry among the Greeks 238 562, among the Latins 400, probably borrowed from the Syriac Church 390.
Polemical poems, Two (Apollinarist) 422.
Polemius, bishop 659.
Polemon alias Polemius (Apollinarist) 244.
Polybius 313.
Polycarp of Smyrna, St. 35—38: his life 35, Epistle to the Philippians 36, Latin fragments 37; Martyrium Polycarpi 229.
Polychronius 322.
Polycrates of Ephesus 126.
Pomerius, see Julianus Pomerius.
Pomponius 427.
Pontianus, pope, St. 223.
Pontianus, bishop 639.
Pontius Paulinus 447—449, cp. 400.
Porphyrius of Gaza 347.
Porphyrius, Neoplatonist 178 243 248 376.
Possidius of Calama 475 478.
Potamius of Olisipo (Lisbon) 412.
Practical Theology, the moral discipline of Christianity, as distinct from its teachings: first set forth by St. Ambrose 398 400 436, other ascetico-moral-writings of the second patristic period 238 400, of the third period 551 599; pastoral Theology systematized by St. Gregory the Great 599. See Homiletics and Catechetics, Collections of Ecclesiastical laws, of Canons, Rules of Orders.
Praedestinatus 123 124 598 599 604.
Praxeas 184.
Predestination, doctrine of: in St. Augustine 501, in St. Prosper of Aquitaine 512, in St. Fulgentius of Ruspe 617 618.
Predestinationism, defended by Lucidus 598 600, by Pseudo-Augustinus 604.
Pre-Existence of the Soul, see Soul.
Primacy of the Roman Church 121. See Church.
Primasius of Hadrumetum 642.
Priscillian 428; Priscillianism 427, its defenders and opponents 429.
Proba 420.
Proclus, Montanist 85 124.
Proclus, patriarch 369.
Proclus, poet 607.
Procopius of Gaza 541—543.
Prosper (?) of Africa 514.

Prosper of Aquitaine, St. 511—514. See Tiro Prosper.
Prosper Augustanus 514.
Protevangelium Jacobi 87.
Protrepticus of Clement of Alexandria 129.
Prudentius Clemens 444—447.
Psenosiris, Letter of 162.
Pseudo-Beda 632.
Pseudo-Callisthenes, see Callisthenes.
Pseudo-Dionysius Areopagita, see Dionysius Areopagita.
Ptolemaeus 77.

Quadratus 46.
Quicumque vult 255 261.

Rabbulas of Edessa 395 396.
Recognitions, Clementine, see Clementinae.
Religious Colloquy at court of the Sassanids 574.
Remigius of Rheims, St. 612.
Resurrection of the body: according to Athenagoras 64, St. Methodius of Olympus 176, St. Gregory of Nyssa 302.
Reticius of Autun 228.
Rhodon 61 117 123.
Romanus Melodos, St. 562 563.
Rufinus 512.
Rufinus of Aquileia 82 141 247 250.
Ruricius of Limoges 602 603.
Rusticus of Bordeaux 519.
Rusticus (Rusticius) Diaconus 640.
Rusticus Helpidius (Elpidius), see Helpidius.
Rusticus of Narbonne 519.
Rusticus Presbyter 519.

Sabellius 242; Sabellianism 241. See Patripassianism
Sabinus of Heraclea 238 241 378 379.
Sacramentarium: Bobbiense 111, Leonianum 525 526, Gelasianum 621 622, Gregorianum 654 656.
Sacraments, their objective efficacy defended against the Donatists: by St. Optatus of Mileve 427, by St. Augustine 483. See Baptism, Eucharist, Marriage.
Saints, Lives of, see Vitae Sanctorum.
Sallustius 452.
Salonius of Geneva 519.
Salvianus of Marseilles 605 606.
Sampsaei 81.
Satornilus 73.
Sayings of Jesus, see Logia Iesu, Agrapha.
Schools and Tendencies: theological 235 398, Alexandrine Catechetical School 127, Neo-Alexandrine School 235, Antiochene Exegetical School 235, School of Caesarea 127, of Edessa 384, of Southern Gaul 398.
Scripture, Sacred, see Biblical Theology, Canon, Testament.
Secundinus, poet 613.
Secundinus, Manichaean 483.
Sedatus of Biterrae 650.
Sedulius 450.
Semipelagianism 512 515; chiefly in Southern Gaul 398.
Seneca 658.
Seneca, correspondence of Paul and Seneca 112.
Serapion of Alexandria 159.
Serapion of Antioch 93 126.
Serapion, St., of Thmuis 269 270.
Sergius of Constantinople 564.
Seta 563.
Severianus, poet 607.
Severianus of Gabala 527.
Severus of Antioch 547; Severiani of Phartolatrae 547.
Severus of Malaga 664.
Severus of Minorca 511.
Severus Sanctus Endelechius, see Endelechius.
Sextus, Anti-Gnostic 118.
Sigebert of Gemblaux 8 624.
Simeon, Bishop of Betharsam 552.
Simeon, «the new theologian» 585.
Simeon Stylites, St. (Junior) 562.
Simplicianus, St. 444 455.
Simplicius, Pope, St. 620 621.
Siricius, Pope, St. 444.
Sisinnius of Constantinople 54.
Sixtus II., Pope, St. 224, cp. 199.
Sixtus III., Pope, St. 526.
Socrates 378.
Sophia Iesu Christi 75.
Sophia Valentini 77.
Sophronius, friend of St. Jerome 274.
Sophronius of Jerusalem, St. 560 561 564 565.
Soranus of Ephesus 188.
Soter, Pope, St. 123 124.
Soul: corporeal according to Tertullian 188, and Faustus of Riez 601, incorporeal according to Claudianus Mamertus 601 603; pre-existence of, according to Origen 152, Didymus the Blind 307, Evagrius Ponticus 308 310; opposed by Peter of Alexandria 159, St. Methodius of Olympus 178, and St. Gregory of Nyssa 302, and St. Barsanuphius 551 (see Origenistic controversies); Tertullian defends Generationism or Traducianism 188, St. Chrysostom defends Creationism 339, St. Augustine is wavering 499; the «dormitio» of the soul after death sustained by Aphraates, opposed by Eustratius of Constantinople 186 561.
Sozomen 378.
Statius 607.
Stephanus, Revelatio Stephani 116.
Stephanus I., Pope, St. 224, cp. 191 198.
Stephanus V., Pope 657.
Stephanus Bar Sudaili 541.

Stephanus of Bostra 581.
Stephanus of Dora 565.
Stephanus of Gobarus 117 544.
Stephanus Presbyter 112.
Stephen, Bishop of Siuniq 567.
Stromata of Clement of Alexandria 129.
Subordinationism, in Trinitarian doctrine: accepted by Origen 152, Dionysius of Alexandria 155, Tertullian 185, Arnobius 202.
Sulpicius Severus, St. 451.
Syagrius 430.
Sylvia, St. 424.
Symbolum Apostolorum 17 18; Athanasianum 255 261. See Quicumque.
Symmachus, City-Prefect 445 475 607.
Symmachus, Ebionite 81.
Symmachus, Pope, St. 621.
Symphosius 208.
Synesius of Cyrene 358—359: life 358, writings 359, literature 359.
Syriac writers 384.

Tacitus 452.
Tatian, the Assyrian 57—61: life 57, Apology 58, Diatessaron 59, lost writings 60.
Te Deum 440 442 443.
Tertullian 179—190: life 179, works 179, apologetic 182, dogmatico-polemical 184, ascetico-practical 186, De anima and De pallio 188, lost writings 189, spurious writings 190.
Testament, Old and New: according to the Epistle of Barnabas 23, transitory character of the Law of Moses according to the Apologists 45, St. Justin Martyr 52, Tertullian 183, St. Cyprian 196, the Old Testament a revelation of the one true God according to St. Augustine 482.
Testament of Our Lord 355 356.
Tetrapla 140.
Thaddaeus, Legend of 109.
Thalassius, abbot 573.
Thalassius, monk 369.
Theban Legion 518.
Thecla: Acts of Paul and Thecla 102, Vitae S. Theclae 532.
Themison 85.
Theoctistus of Caesarea 164.
Theodoret of Cyrus 370—376: life 370, works: apologetical 371, dogmatico-polemical 372, exegetical 373, historical 373, homilies and letters 374, Christology 374, spurious writings 375, complete editions, translations, recensions of separate works 375 376, literature on 376.
Theodorus, abbot 266.
Theodorus, bishop 160.
Theodorus of Heraclea 240.
Theodorus Lector 552.
Theodorus of Mopsuestia 318—322: life 318, exegetical writings, hermeneutical principles, limitation of the Canon 319—320, other writings 320, Christology 320 361, doctrine on grace 320, editions 321, works on Theodorus 322.
Theodorus of Petra 558.
Theodorus Prodromus 569.
Theodorus of Scythopolis 551.
Theodosians 575.
Theodosius, Archidiaconus 638.
Theodosius of Jerusalem 370.
Theodotus of Ancyra 369.
Theodotus, Valentinian 77 130.
Theognostus 156.
Theon 596.
Theonas of Alexandria 158.
Theopaschite controversy 530 547.
Theophanes Confessor 552.
Theophilus of Alexandria 311 315 325 339 360.
Theophilus of Antioch 65—67: life 65, Libri Tres ad Autolycum 66, lost writings 67 116.
Theophilus, bishop 165.
Theophilus of Caesarea 126.
Theophorus, see Ignatius of Antioch.
Theotecnus 165.
Thomas, The Apostle, St.: Gospel 94, Acts 106, later recensions of the Thomas-Legend 107, Revelatio Thomae 116.
Thomas Aquinas, St. 367 632.
Three Chapters controversy 530 549 598 637 638—641.
Tiberianus 429.
Tichonius 427 471.
Timocles 563.
Timotheus, Dialogus Timothei et Aquilae 49.
Timotheus Aelurus 532.
Timotheus of Alexandria 255 381.
Timotheus of Berytus 238 245 377 378.
Timotheus of Constantinople 575.
Tiro Prosper, St. 511—514.
Titus of Bostra 270 271.
Tradition, Oral, source of faith: according to Papias 43, St. Irenaeus 120, St. Basil the Great 280, Vincent of Lerins 521. See Faith.
Trinity, The Holy: term first used by Theophilus of Antioch 66, doctrine of Trinity in Athenagoras 65, Tertullian 185, St. Hippolytus 210, St. Athanasius 259, St. Basil the Great 281, St. Gregory of Nazianzus 291, St. Gregory of Nyssa 300, Didymus the Blind 308. See Christology, Holy Ghost, Subordinationism.
Tritheists 544, cp. 530.
Trithemius 8.
Trypho 153.
Trypho, The Jew, see St. Justin Martyr.

Turibius of Astorga, St. 430.
Tychonius, see Tichonius.
Tyrannius Rufinus 453.

Ulfilas 412.
Uranius 449.

Valentinus, Apollinarist 244.
Valentinus, Gnostic 76.
Valerianus of Cemele 522.
Varro 480.
Venantius Fortunatus 647—650, cp. 599.
Veranus of Vence 519.
Verecundus of Junca 641.
Versus ad gratiam Domini 421.
Victor I., Pope, St. 77 119 122 125.
Victor of Antioch 570.
Victor of Capua 628.
Victor of Cartenna 615.
Victor of Tunnuna 637 640 662.
Victor of Vita 614 615.
Victor, see Marius Victor.
Victoricius of Rouen 444.
Victorinus of Pettau 227, cp. 190.
Victorinus, see Marius Victorinus.
Victorius (Victurius) 514.
Vigilius, Pope 639.
Vigilius of Tapsus 430 615 616.
Vigilius of Trent 444.
Vincent of Lerinum 520.
Vincentius Presbyter 604.
Virgil 199 420 433 607 610; Centones Virgiliani 420.
Virgilius, The supposed 638.
Vita Barlaam et Joasaph 587 589.
Vita Constantini M. 246 251.
Vitae Sanctorum: St. Albini 649, St. Alexandri 396, St. Ambrosii 513, St. Antonii monachi Aegypt. 258 262 264, St. Antonii monachi Lerin. 623, St. Artemii 588 589, St. Augustini 475 478, St. Auxentii 563, St. Aviti 610, St. Benedicti 653 656, St. Caesarii 611 612, St. Cypriani 190 191, St. Cyriaci 558 559, St. Cyri et Ioannis 560, St. Epiphanii episc. Constant 313, St. Epiphanii episc. Ticin. 623, St. Eugeniae 454, St. Eusebii Alex. 370, St. Euthymii 558 559, St. Eutychii patr. 561, St. Fulgentii 616 617, St. Gerasimi 559, St. Germani 649, St. Gregorii Agrigent. 561, St. Gregorii Armeni 590, St. Gregorii Magni papae 656, St. Gregorii Thaumat. 170 171 300, St. Hilarii Arelat. 520, St. Hilarii Pictav. 649, St. Hilarionis 464 472, St. Honorati Arelat. 520, St. Hypatii 379, St. Ioannis Chrysostomi 348 562, St. Ioannis Climaci 572 573, St. Ioannis Damasceni 568 583, St. Ioannis Eleemosynarii 560 561, St. Ioannis Moschi 560, St. Ioannis Silentiarii 558 559, St. Isaiae abbatis 553, St. Iuliani 645, St. Macrinae 300, St. Malchi 464 472, St. Marcelli 649, St. Mariae Aegypt. 560, St. Martini Turon. 452 608 645, St. Mauricii et soc. 518, St. Maximi conf. 576, St. Mesropi 592, St. Pachomii 265, St. Pamphili 166 245, St. Parthenii 240, St. Paterni 649, St. Pauli monachi 464 472, St. Petri Iberis 541, St. Porphyrii Gaz. 347, St. Radegundis 649, St. Rhipsimes et soc. 591, St. Sabae 546 558 559, St. Severini 626, St. Silvestri 595, St. Simeonis Sali 561, St. Simeonis Stylitae jun. 562, St. Spiridionis 561, St. Theclae 532, St. Theodosii 558 559, St. Theognii 558 559, Liber vitae Patrum 645. See Acta Martyrum.
Vitalis of Antioch 244.
Voconius 615.
Vulgate, Latin 459—463 470 490 491; Codex Fuldensis 60.

William of St. Theodoric 435.

Xenocharides, *alias* Nexocharides 104.

Zacharias, Apocrypha 116.
Zacharias, Pope 656.
Zacharias of Jerusalem 566.
Zacharias Rhetor 552.
Zeno of Verona 418.
Zephyrinus, Pope, St. 124 125.
Zonaras 172.
Zosimus, Pope, St. 515.